

HIGHER ABEL-JACOBI MAPS FOR 0-CYCLES

MATT KERR

ABSTRACT. Starting from the candidate Bloch-Beilinson filtration on $CH_0(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ constructed in [L2], we develop and describe geometrically a series of Hodge-theoretic invariants Ψ_i defined on the graded pieces. Explicit formulas (in terms of currents and membrane integrals) are given for certain quotients of the Ψ_i , with applications to 0-cycles on products of curves.

1. INTRODUCTION

A classical question in transcendental algebraic geometry, which has seen a resurgence of interest (e.g. [Gr1], [GG3], [L2], [RS]) in recent years, is that of *rational equivalence* of algebraic cycles on a smooth projective variety $X/\mathbb{C}$. For instance, suppose we take two formal sums $\mathcal{Z}_1$ and $\mathcal{Z}_2$ of points with integer multiplicities (or 0-cycles) on X . When can we rationally parametrize a “path” between the two collections? That is, writing $\square := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^1 \setminus \{1\}$ for affine space, when does there exist an algebraic 1-cycle $W \in Z_1(X \times \square)$ such that

$$\mathcal{Z}_1 - \mathcal{Z}_2 = \pi_*^X(W \cdot X \times \{0\}) - \pi_*^X(W \cdot X \times \{\infty\}) \quad ?$$

Or equivalently, when do there exist curves $\mathcal{W}_j$ on X (with desingularizations $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_j \xrightarrow{\iota_j} X$) and functions $f_j \in \mathbb{C}(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_j)^*$ such that $\mathcal{Z}_1 - \mathcal{Z}_2 = \sum \iota_{j*}(f_j)$?

For $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = 1$, this is the familiar question of whether $\mathcal{Z}_1 - \mathcal{Z}_2$ is the divisor of a function, and it is “solved” by Abel’s theorem: the two invariants $\Psi_0 := \text{degree map}$ and $\Psi_1 := \text{Abel-Jacobi map}$ completely detect $\stackrel{\text{rat}}{\neq} 0$ (see for example [G]).

Further invariants are required when $\dim X = n > 1$. The goal at which this paper is aimed, is the explicit description of a series of Hodge-theoretically determined, higher *AJ*-type maps Ψ_i which “completely capture” rational equivalence classes of 0-cycles. (Each Ψ_i should be defined on $\ker(\Psi_{i-1})$.) To make this goal more attainable we simplify things in a couple of ways. All cycle, Chow, K -groups (and related objects) are taken $\otimes \mathbb{Q}$ (i.e. modulo torsion); so

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14C25, 14C30, 14C35, 19D45.

Key words and phrases. Chow group, higher Abel-Jacobi map, Milnor K -theory, regulator, differential character.

$CH^n(X)$ means $CH^n(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$, while $Hg^p(X) := F^p H^{2p}(X, \mathbb{C}) \cap H^{2p}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and $J^p(X) := \frac{H^{2p-1}(X, \mathbb{C})}{F^p \{\text{num}\} + H^{2p-1}(X, \mathbb{Q})}$. We also assume throughout that X is defined over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, which is to say: it is cut out by equations with coefficients in a number field.

Now restrict to those 0-cycles defined over some fixed field k finitely generated $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. (By taking a limit over such $k \subset \mathbb{C}$, one eventually gets all 0-cycles on $X_{\mathbb{C}}$.) Ψ_0 and Ψ_1 are conveniently summarized (e.g., see [Gr2]) by the Deligne cycle-class map

$$c_{\mathcal{D}}^X : CH^n(X_k) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{Q}(n)).$$

According to the Bloch-Beilinson conjecture (BBC), this is injective if $k = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$; otherwise its kernel may be huge, and so one is led naturally into the arithmetic world in dealing with the extension $k/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. One can in fact exchange this extension for additional geometry by performing a $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -spread as described in §2, to obtain a cycle $\zeta \in Z^n(X \times \eta_S)$ defined over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.

A version of the Bloch-Beilinson conjecture for quasi-projective varieties $X \times U$ (of which $X \times \eta_S$ is a limit) now tells us that a refinement

$$c_{\mathcal{H}} : CH^n(X \times \eta_S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$$

of $c_{\mathcal{D}}^{X \times \eta_S}$ is injective. ($H_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$ is absolute Hodge cohomology as defined in [L2].) Placing a Leray filtration on [a subgroup of] $H_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$ as in [L2], the corresponding graded pieces of $c_{\mathcal{H}}(\zeta)$ give the desired invariants

$$\Psi_i : \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k) := \ker(\Psi_{i-1}) \rightarrow Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i H_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)).$$

Intuitively, the idea is to use the product structure of $X \times \eta_S$ to chop up the cycle and AJ -classes of the spread ζ of $\mathcal{Z}$. This story is reviewed abstractly in Part 1 (§§2 – 6). The difficulty is in finding explicit formulas for the resulting maps; this occupies us for much of the remainder of the paper, which is divided into Part 2 (§§7 – 9), Part 3 (§§10 – 12), and Part 4 (Applications, §§13 – 17).

Two remarks are in order. First, we wish to emphasize the tenuous nature of BBC. There are very simple cases where it is not known. A particularly striking example was pointed out to the author by P. Griffiths: say we present a $K3$ surface X as a double cover of $\mathbb{P}^2$ branched over a smooth sextic curve with affine equation $f(x, y) = 0$. Then for any $x, y \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ not solving f ,

$$\mathcal{Z}_{x,y} := (x, y, +\sqrt{f(x,y)}) - (x, y, -\sqrt{f(x,y)}) \in \ker(c_{\mathcal{D}}^X) \subseteq CH^2(X_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$$

since $h^{1,0}(X) = 0$; but we are not aware of any proof that (some multiple of) $\mathcal{Z}_{x,y} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{=} 0$. If BBC fails (for quasi-projectives) then the series Ψ_i is still (well-)defined but their kernels do not exhaust $CH^n(X_k)$. So without the aid of conjectures, at present the best we can hope for is to detect $\mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\neq} 0$ when

$c_{\mathcal{D}}^X(\mathcal{Z}) = 0$, by showing e.g. $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z})$ or $\Psi_3(\mathcal{Z}) \neq 0$. Some concrete examples (and techniques) are given in Part 4.

The second remark, is that in case one replaces X by a relative variety (X, Y) (as we do in Part 2) one must also require that $f_j \equiv 1$ on $\iota_j^{-1}(\mathcal{W}_j \cap Y)$ in the above definition of rational equivalence of 0-cycles.

The present paper is a fusion between the algebraic computation of the Ψ_i target-spaces in [L2], the geometric point of view in [GG3], and the work on regulator maps in [Ke1]. Its central results are the presentation (in Part 3) of a quotient of $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$, as a (geometrically defined) vector-valued differential character on the “base” η_S of the spread; and (for X a product of curves) its representation via explicit $(i - 1)$ -currents on S (in §14). These “reduced invariants” $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ (and the currents) are motivated by a study of analogous invariants in the degenerate situation $X = (\square^n, \partial\square^n)$ in Part 2, which turn out to be computed by the Milnor-regulator currents of [Ke1] (on η_S). (Here $(\square^n, \partial\square^n)$ denotes affine n -space relative its faces; we also study the situation for $X = (\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n$, which we think of as a product of degenerate elliptic curves.) Our general philosophy is that the degenerate invariants, or $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})$, can be “pushed down” to functionals on topological $(i - 1)$ -cycles on the base of the spread.

The geometric construction of the χ_i , followed by the proof that they are well-defined on $\mathcal{L}^i CH_0$ and are factored by the Ψ_i , is contained in §11. Involved in the proof (of Proposition 11.2) is an interesting technical observation: Künneth components of Abel-Jacobi classes of (algebraic) cycles $\zeta \stackrel{\text{hom}}{=} 0$ on quasiprojective varieties $X \times U$, whose closure $\bar{\zeta}$ on $X \times S$ may not be homologous to zero, can still be partially computed by straightforward membrane integrals. (In fact, what we prove is stronger than this.) See Remark 4.1 and remarks preceding Prop. 11.2 for further discussion.

We also offer some description of the full invariants Ψ_i and their targets, in §§ 4, 5, 10, and 12. That in §12 leads to a very simple proof (in §15, using Ψ_2) of a result of [RS] for certain 0-cycles on products of curves, which we then apply to special Kummer ($K3$) surfaces in §17. Finally, we present evidence that the reduced invariant χ_2 may do just as well as Ψ_2 at detecting such 0-cycles. We prove a statement along these lines for products of elliptic curves in §16 using a result (and in one special case a conjecture) on algebraic independence of values of elliptic logarithms. This appears to be the first result of its kind, bringing transcendence theory to bear on higher Abel-Jacobi maps, and should be interesting to pursue further.

We should emphasize that this paper is foundational in nature; most of it was written before [Ke4] and [Ke5], which rely heavily on the framework and

technical results of the present §§2 – 5, 10 – 14. Several original applications to the detection of explicit “new” cycles (not previously known to be nontrivial) can be found in those papers, e.g. §§6.1, 6.3, 8.2 of [Ke4]. The arguments in the present §§10 – 11 will also be applied to the study of higher Chow cycles [KL].

For the orientation of the reader we point out that a review of Lewis’s description of the Ψ_i -targets $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times_{\eta_S} \mathbb{Q}(n))$ may be found in §4. In §10, we give also an explicit “Deligne-homology”-type presentation of the $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$; this just means a description obtained by resolving a relevant Deligne-Beilinson cone complex by acyclic sheaves (as in [Ja1]).

We thank Mark Green and James Lewis for helpful conversations, and UCLA and MPI-Bonn for support while this paper was being written.

Part 1. Abstract definition of the invariants

2. SPREAD PHILOSOPHY

Let X be an n -dimensional smooth projective variety defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, and $k \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a finitely generated extension of $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\text{trdeg}(k/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) =: t < \infty$. We consider 0-cycles $\mathcal{Z} \in Z^n(X_k)$, where $X_k := X \times_{(\text{Spec } \bar{\mathbb{Q}})} \text{Spec } k$; our aim is to develop invariants to detect their rational equivalence classes $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \in CH^n(X_k)$. An important tool will be the “ $\mathbb{Q}$ -spread” ζ of $\mathcal{Z}$; we give three versions (the first of which we shall not use):

Arithmetic spread. Let $S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a smooth projective variety with $\dim S = t$

and rational function field $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \xrightarrow[e]{\cong} k$. Then e^{-1} induces base change to

$$\tilde{\zeta} := \mathcal{Z} \times_{(\text{Spec } k)} \text{Spec } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \in Z^n(X \times \text{Spec } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)).$$

Trivially, $\langle \tilde{\zeta} \rangle \equiv 0 \Leftrightarrow \langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \equiv 0$; we have merely applied e^{-1} to the coefficients of the (homogeneous) defining equations of $\mathcal{Z}$ (in $k[X]$).

Full (geometric) spread. A choice of hyperplane section now induces a $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -algebra homomorphism $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}[S] \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}} \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)$ of the homogeneous coordinate ring into the function field. (If L is a linear form corresponding to the hyperplane, set $\mathcal{I}(F) = \frac{F}{L^d}$ for F homogeneous of degree d , and extend linearly. The induced map $\text{Spec } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \rightarrow \text{Proj } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}[S]$ gives a generic point of S , in the Zariski context.) Clearing denominators from the defining equations of $\tilde{\zeta}$ therefore yields

(bihomogeneous) equations cutting out a cycle $\bar{\zeta} \in Z^n(X \times S)$ which maps to $\tilde{\zeta}$ under $Z^n(X \times \text{Proj } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}[S]) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}} Z^n(X \times \text{Spec } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S))$.

This “full spread” $\bar{\zeta}$ has defects: neither the choice of S nor the clearing of denominators is unique; so the behavior of $\bar{\zeta}$ over codimension-1 ($\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -)subvarieties of S (where its relative dimension over S may exceed 0) is ambiguous. In fact $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \equiv 0$ (on X_k) $\iff \bar{\zeta}$ is rationally equivalent to a cycle supported on $X \times \{\text{codim. } 1 \subseteq S\}$; to see this, simply spread or restrict a given rational equivalence.

Its two advantages: that $\bar{\zeta}$ is defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ will be essential for our use of the Bloch-Beilinson conjecture below. Moreover, a fixed choice of $\bar{\zeta}$ may be complexified (along with $X \times S$) and considered as a formal sum (with rational coefficients) of irreducible analytic subvarieties of $X \times S$. This allows us to work in the realm of Hodge theory, perform the integrals defining the AJ -maps, and so on.

Throughout the paper, we will use the following notation for “maps” related to $\bar{\zeta}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & & \bar{\zeta} \\
 & & \rho_X & \nearrow & \\
 X & \xleftarrow{\pi_X} & X \times S & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \\
 & \searrow \pi_S & \downarrow \pi_S & \searrow \rho_S & \\
 & & S & &
 \end{array}$$

Here ρ_X , ρ_S , and ι are really formal sums of the corresponding maps $\rho_X^i : \tilde{\zeta}_i \rightarrow X$ on (desingularizations of) the irreducible components of $\bar{\zeta} = \sum m_i \tilde{\zeta}_i$.

Remark 2.1. These maps are both holomorphic and proper. Hence, given a (closed) holomorphic form ω on X , one may pull it back along ρ_X^i . Viewing the resulting holomorphic form as a current of type $(i, 0)$, one may push it forward along ρ_S^i to obtain (since $\text{codim}_{X \times S}(\bar{\zeta}) = \dim(X)$) a closed $(i, 0)$ current on S . By a standard $\bar{\partial}$ -regularity lemma from Hodge theory ([L1, ch. 10]), such a current is in fact a holomorphic form. We write $\rho_{S*}^i \rho_X^{i*} \omega$ for the result and define $\rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega := \sum_i m_i \rho_{S*}^i \rho_X^{i*} \omega$, which gives a map $\Omega^i(X) \rightarrow \Omega^i(S)$. This is used in §§11ff.

Final version of spread. This will share the advantageous properties of $\bar{\zeta}$, while lacking the ambiguities and being equivalent to $\tilde{\zeta}$ from an algebraic point

of view $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Namely, take ζ to be the image of $\bar{\zeta}$ under the restriction

$$j: Z^n(X \times S) \longrightarrow \lim_{\substack{D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset S \\ \text{codim. } 1}} Z^n(X \times S \setminus D) =: Z^n(X \times \eta_S).$$

(Here η_S is just the limit of the affine Zariski-open sets $S \setminus D$; for our purposes, this is a much better definition of “generic point” than $\text{Spec } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)$.) Clearly $\zeta \stackrel{\text{rat}}{=} 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{=} 0$ and

$$CH^n(X \times \eta_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}) := \lim_{\overrightarrow{D \subset S}} CH^n(X \times (S \setminus D)) \cong CH^n(X \times \text{Spec } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)) \cong CH^n(X_k).$$

To consider $X \times \eta_S$ as an analytic variety (possessing $C^\infty(p, q)$ -forms/currents, topological chains, etc.), simply work on a (complexified) arbitrary representative $X \times S \setminus D$ of the limit. In subsequent sections, this will usually be tacit (as will complexification). We also note that cohomology groups (singular, absolute Hodge, etc.) of η_S or $X \times \eta_S$ are implicitly defined via the obvious direct limits (which are exact in the category of abelian groups), and homology by inverse limits.

The (very many) $\mathbb{C}$ -points $s \in \eta_S(\times_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \mathbb{C})$ are those which survive in the limit, i.e. belong to the complexification of no $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset S$. These are “very general” points of S . They correspond to embeddings $e_s: \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \xrightarrow{\cong} k_s \subset \mathbb{C}$, in the sense that restricting $\zeta_{\mathbb{C}}|_{X \times \{s\}} =: \mathcal{Z}_s^{\mathbb{C}}$ gives precisely the complexification of $\mathcal{Z}_s := \tilde{\zeta} \times_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)} k_s \in Z^n(X_{k_s})$ [base change via e_s]. We write $s_0 \in \eta_S^{\mathbb{C}}$ for the point corresponding to $e: \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \xrightarrow{\cong} k$, so that $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_{s_0}$, $\mathcal{Z} \times_k \mathbb{C} = \zeta_{\mathbb{C}}|_{X \times \{s_0\}}$.

3. BACKGROUND ON LERAY FILTRATION

Given $\mathcal{Z} \in Z^n(X_k)$, the last section yields $\bar{\zeta} \in Z^n(X \times S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ and maps

$$Z^n(X_k) \xleftarrow{e \circ \mathcal{I}} Z^n(X \times S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \xrightarrow{j} Z^n(X \times \eta_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$$

sending $\mathcal{Z} \longmapsto \bar{\zeta} \longmapsto \zeta$. The restriction j factors through $e \circ \mathcal{I}$, and so the resulting “spread map”

$$Z^n(X_k) \xrightarrow{\cong} Z^n(X \times \eta_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$$

sends $\mathcal{Z} \mapsto \zeta$.

Now let $c_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $c_{\mathcal{H}}$ denote cycle-class maps into Deligne and absolute Hodge cohomology (resp.), e.g. see [L2] or [Ja1]. (Absolute Hodge keeps track of $F^\bullet$ and $W_\bullet$, Deligne only $F^\bullet$. They are the same in the [smooth] projective case. See §2 of [L2] also for discussion of BBC^q .) Working modulo torsion and

assuming a Bloch-Beilinson conjecture (BBC^q) for smooth (quasi-projective) varieties, from the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 CH^n(X \times S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) & \xrightarrow[c_D]{(\text{BBC})} & H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \\
 \swarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \Phi \\
 CH^n(X_k) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{} CH^n(X \times \eta_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}) & \xrightarrow[c_{\mathcal{H}}]{(\text{BBC}^q)} H_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))
 \end{array}$$

we see that

$$CH^n(X_k) \xrightarrow{\Psi} \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) := \text{im}(\Phi).$$

One should think of $\text{im}(\Phi)$ as the lowest weight part of $H_{\mathcal{H}}$. Lewis [L2] constructs on this a Leray filtration $\mathcal{L}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$ (with $\mathcal{L}^0 = \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$, $\mathcal{L}^i \supseteq \mathcal{L}^{i+1}$), which induces a corresponding filtration

$$\mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k) := \Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{L}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n})$$

on the Chow groups. So Ψ breaks naturally into “graded pieces”

$$\Psi_i : \ker(\Psi_{i-1}) = \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k) \longrightarrow Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n));$$

$\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ is well-defined for $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^i CH^n$, and $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^i$ if $\Psi_0(\mathcal{Z}) = \dots = \Psi_{i-1}(\mathcal{Z}) = 0$.

Computation of the $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$ (e.g., eqn. (4.5) below) shows that they are “controlled” by $H^{2n-i}(X, \frac{\mathbb{C}}{\mathbb{Q}})$ (e.g., if the latter groups vanish then so do the $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i$). Writing $\mathbf{H}/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset X$ for a hyperplane section, functoriality properties yield a diagram (see [L2, Prop. 5.0])

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{L}^{n+\ell} CH^n(X_k) & \xrightarrow{\Psi_{n+\ell}} & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{n+\ell} \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n} & - - - - & H^{n-\ell}(X) \\
 \downarrow \cdot [\mathbf{H}]^{\ell} & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \text{Lefschetz} \\
 \underbrace{\mathcal{L}^{n+\ell} CH^{n+\ell}(X_k)}_{=0 \text{ (dim } X = n)} & \xrightarrow{\Psi_{n+\ell}} & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{n+\ell} \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n+2\ell} & - - - - & H^{n+\ell}(X)
 \end{array}$$

showing $\Psi_{n+\ell} = 0$ (for $\ell > 1$). That is, $\mathcal{L}^{n+1} CH^n(X_k) = \bigcap_i \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k) = 0$ if BBC^q holds]; so only Ψ_0 thru Ψ_n are nontrivial maps, and one expects they completely capture rational equivalence.

In fact, if $t (= \text{trdeg}(k/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = \dim S) < n - 1$ then only Ψ_0 thru Ψ_{t+1} are nonzero. Writing

$$\underline{H}^*(\eta_S, -) := \text{im} \{H^*(S, -) \rightarrow H^*(\eta_S, -)\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\underline{H}_*(\eta_S, -) := \text{coim} \{H_*(\eta_S, -) \rightarrow H_*(S, -)\},$$

the cohomology of S involved in $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$ is $\underline{H}^i(\eta_S)$ and $\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S)$ (see §4). Since $H^{t+\ell}(S)$ is concentrated (by Lefschetz again) in codimension ≥ 1 (for $\ell \geq 1$), $\underline{H}^{t+\ell}(\eta_S) = 0$; therefore $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{(t+1)+\ell} \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n} = 0$. Summing up this discussion of “termination” of $\mathcal{L}^\bullet$:

Proposition 3.1. *For $i > \min\{n, t+1\}$, we have $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i CH^n(X_k) = 0$; if BBC^q holds, then also $\mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k) = 0$.*

Next we explain how this picture applies to the Chow groups of all cycles defined $/\mathbb{C}$. To obtain Ψ_i for (filtered pieces of) $CH^n(X_{\mathbb{C}})$, we first define (with [L2]) $\mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_{\mathbb{C}}) := \varinjlim_{k \in \mathbb{C}} \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k)$ (where the limit is over k finitely generated over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$). Taking a limit over all finite-dimensional smooth projective $S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, one has

$$\Psi_i : \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow \varinjlim_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)).$$

Remark. The maps $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow{p_i^*} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_{S'}, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ allowed in defining this limit are only those arising from *dominant* morphisms $S' \xrightarrow{p} S$ (which correspond to inclusions $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \hookrightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S')$). These maps p_i^* are all injective: since they depend on S, S' only up to birational equivalence, it suffices to check this for the cases where the extension $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S') : \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)$ is algebraic or transcendental, which are easy.

If $H^0(\Omega_X^\ell) \neq 0$ for some $(n \geq) \ell \geq 2$, then the target space of Ψ_ℓ is ∞ -dimensional, as one would expect in connection with *Mumford's theorem*. We briefly remind the reader what this says, and set a couple of conventions for later use. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and base point $p \in X$, there is a map

$$S^{(N)}(X_{\mathbb{C}}) \xrightarrow{\pi_N} CH_{\text{hom}}^n(X_{\mathbb{C}})$$

$$Sym_N(p_1, \dots, p_N) \longmapsto \sum_{j=1}^N \langle p_j \rangle - N \langle p \rangle.$$

One says $CH_{[\text{hom}]}^n(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ is “infinite-dimensional” (over $\mathbb{C}$) if the sequence $d_N = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\text{im}(\pi_N))$ is unbounded (given a suitable definition of dimension for this image, see [L1, Ch. 15]). The following consequence of [L1, Prop. 15.3] is nontrivial:

Proposition 3.2. $\dim(CH^n(X_{\mathbb{C}})) = \infty \iff \text{no } \pi_N \text{ is surjective.}$

Mumford's theorem [as generalized by Roitman] states that $H^0(\Omega_X^\ell) \neq 0$ for some $\ell \geq 2 \implies d_N \geq N \implies [Gr_L^\ell]CH^n(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ is ∞ -dimensional.

We conclude the section with an important description of the groups $\underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q})$ introduced above. Note that well-definedness is an issue, since different S 's may have the “same η_S ”.

Proposition 3.3. $\underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q})$ is a (pure, finite-dimensional) Hodge structure. In particular, it is well-defined and equal to $W_i H^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) := \varinjlim W_i H^i(U, \mathbb{Q})$ (limit over $U \subseteq S$ affine Zariski-open).

Proof. First let $U \xrightarrow{\iota} S$ be affine Zariski open. By [H], there exists an embedded resolution of $S \setminus U$. This yields $\hat{S} \xrightarrow{b} S$, with b a finite composition of blow-ups at nonsingular centers contained in the successive preimages of $S \setminus U$, such that $b^{-1}(U) \cong U$ and $\hat{S} \setminus b^{-1}(U)$ is a normal-crossings divisor (NCD). Since $H^i(\hat{S}) \rightarrow H^i(b^{-1}(U)) \cong H^i(U)$ factors as $\iota^* \circ b_*$ (or from the description of cohomology of a blow-up), $\text{im}\{H^i(S) \rightarrow H^i(U)\} = \text{im}\{H^i(\hat{S}) \rightarrow H^i(U)\}$; and by [De1, cor. 3.2.17] (since $(\hat{S} \setminus b^{-1}(U)) = \text{NCD}$) the latter is $W_i H^i(U)$. Hence $\text{im}\{H^i(S) \rightarrow H^i(U)\} = W_i H^i(U)$, and taking a limit gives $\underline{H}^i(\eta_S) = W_i H^i(\eta_S)$.

Well-definedness is a trivial consequence of this description, but this uses well-definedness of the $W_i H^i(U)$. One can argue more directly as follows: if for some affine U_0 , $S_1 \xleftarrow{\iota_1} U_0 \xrightarrow{\iota_2} S_2$ are Zariski-open embeddings (that is, if $\eta_{S_1} \cong \eta_{S_2}$), then it suffices to show $\text{im}(\iota_1^*) = \text{im}(\iota_2^*)$ in $H^i(U_0)$. Now simply take the closure (in $S_1 \times S_2$) of the “diagonal” $(\iota_1 \times \iota_2)$ -image of U_0 , and write S_0 for a desingularization. The obvious morphisms $S_0 \twoheadrightarrow S_1$, $S_0 \twoheadrightarrow S_2$ then induce surjective push-forwards on cohomology factoring the restriction ι_0^* to $H^i(U_0)$, and so $\text{im}(\iota_1^*) = \text{im}(\iota_0^*) = \text{im}(\iota_2^*)$. $\square$

Remark. The reader may also wonder about well-definedness of $\underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}} = \text{im}(\Phi)$; this follows from remark 4.2 below.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE INVARIANTS

Let $H_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a MHS (=rational mixed Hodge structure), and write $H_{\mathbb{C}} = H_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{C}$, $W_0 H_{\mathbb{C}} = (W_0 H_{\mathbb{Q}}) \otimes \mathbb{C}$ and so on. Then (see [Ja2, sec. 9])

$$Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H_{\mathbb{Q}}) = F^0 W_0 H_{\mathbb{C}} \cap W_0 H_{\mathbb{Q}}, \quad Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), H_{\mathbb{Q}}) = \frac{W_0 H_{\mathbb{C}}}{W_0 H_{\mathbb{Q}} + F^0 W_0 H_{\mathbb{C}}}$$

so that

$$(4.1) \quad Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)) = \{F^n W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{C}} \cap W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{Q}}\}(n),$$

$$(4.2) \quad Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), H_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)) = \left\{ \frac{W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{C}}}{W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{Q}} + F^n W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{C}}} \right\} (n).$$

We will omit the (n) frequently when it is not important.

To relate $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ to geometry we first fix notions of cycle-class and Abel-Jacobi class for ζ . There is a diagram of short-exact sequences

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & J^n(X \times S) & & Hg^n(X \times S) & \\ & \parallel & & \parallel & \\ Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^{2n-1}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))) & \xrightarrow{q} & H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) & \xrightarrow{p} & Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))) \\ \downarrow \text{"}\Phi & & \downarrow \Phi & & \downarrow \text{'}\Phi \\ Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))) & \xrightarrow{q} & H_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) & \xrightarrow{p} & Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))) \end{array}$$

In fact $\text{im}(\text{"}\Phi) \xrightarrow{q} \text{im}(\Phi) \xrightarrow{p} \text{im}(\text{'}\Phi)$ is also short-exact (since $\ker(\Phi) \longrightarrow \ker(\text{'}\Phi)$, see [L2, p. 317]), and equals

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{array}{c} Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))) =: \underline{Hg}^n(X \times \eta_S) \\ \uparrow p \\ \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \\ \uparrow q \\ \frac{Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), W_{-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)))}{Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), Gr_0^W H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)))} =: \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S). \end{array}$$

Recalling that $c_{\mathcal{H}}(\zeta) = \Phi(c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}))$, we define the fundamental class of the spread to be

$$[\zeta] := p(c_{\mathcal{H}}(\zeta)) = \text{'}\Phi[p(c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}))] = \text{'}\Phi[\bar{\zeta}] \in \underline{Hg}^n(X \times \eta_S).$$

If this is zero, define the AJ -class in $\underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$ by $q[AJ\zeta] = c_{\mathcal{H}}(\zeta)$.

To compute $[AJ\zeta]$, one observes (using [De2, cor. 8.2.8]) that

$$[\zeta] = 0 \implies [\bar{\zeta}] \in \ker(\text{'}\Phi) = \bigcup_{\substack{D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset S \\ \text{codim. } 1}} \text{im} \left\{ Hg^{n-1}(X \times \tilde{D}) \right\};$$

according to the Hodge conjecture one then expects to be able to modify $\bar{\zeta}$ “over D ” by $\eta \in N_S^1 Z^n(X \times S) := \bigcup_{D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \text{im}\{Z^{n-1}(X \times D)\}$ so that $[\bar{\zeta} - \eta] = 0$ (of course $\eta \in \ker(\Phi)$). Then $[AJ\zeta] = \text{"}\Phi[AJ(\bar{\zeta} - \eta)]$, which can be computed by the usual Griffiths prescription (on $X \times S$). Namely, one integrates over a topological membrane (i.e., C^∞ chain) bounding on $\bar{\zeta} - \eta$ (of real dimension $2t+1$, written $\partial^{-1}(\bar{\zeta} - \eta)$). This produces a functional on $F^{t+1} H^{2t+1}(X \times S, \mathbb{C})$,

which taken modulo periods gives $AJ(\bar{\zeta} - \eta)$. In particular, if $\dim(S) = 1$ and $\dim(X) = 2$, then the HC on $X \times \tilde{D}$ is just Lefschetz (1,1), so such an approach is practical. Moreover, there are plenty of cases (for higher dimensional X and S) where one can explicitly write down a homologically trivial choice of full spread $\bar{\zeta}$ (and avoid the HC).

Remark 4.1. In general there is no circumventing this “lift” to [a nullhomologous] $\bar{\zeta}$ for computing $[AJ\zeta]$ and its graded pieces (defined below) by membrane integrals. While from $\zeta \stackrel{\text{hom}}{\equiv} 0$ one *can* obtain a chain $\partial^{-1}\zeta$ bounding on ζ mod [chains w./ support on] $X \times D$, the naive idea that this should lead to a functional on $\varprojlim_D F^{t+1}H^{2t+1}(X \times S, X \times D; \mathbb{C})$ [modulo periods] and ultimately an element of $\underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$, does not work out for X smooth projective.

The situation is different if X is one of the special *relative* varieties of Part 2, due to the occurrence of a Hodge-theoretic miracle (see §§7–8). The miracle (or, if one prefers, catastrophe) produces a very convenient set of test forms (for $\varprojlim_D F^{t+1}H^{2t+1}(X \times (S, D), \mathbb{C})$) to integrate over (essentially) $\partial^{-1}\zeta$, namely products of [Poincaré duals to] certain topological cycles on S and “holomorphic” forms on X . Integrating only such forms for ordinary projective X computes (in contrast) only quotients of the graded pieces of $[AJ\zeta]$; but at least these quotients are computable by membrane integrals without requiring $[\bar{\zeta}] = 0$. (The integrals take place on X rather than on S .) This is the idea behind the *reduced* higher AJ maps of §11.

Now referring back to eqn. (4.4), the Ext^1/Hom quotient (in $\underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$) is computed by observing that there is a natural series of maps

$$\begin{aligned} & Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), Gr_0^W H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)))(-n) \cong \\ & \ker \{ F^n Gr_{2n}^W H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \oplus Gr_{2n}^W H^{2n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow Gr_{2n}^W H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \} \\ & \rightarrow \frac{\{ F^n W_{2n} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C}) + W_{2n} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \} \cap \{ W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \}}{\text{im} \{ F^n W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \oplus W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \}} \\ & \rightarrow \frac{W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C})}{F^n W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C}) + W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q})} \\ & \cong Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), W_{-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)))(-n). \end{aligned}$$

(Note that $W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S)$ is just $\text{im}(H^{2n-1}(X \times S) \rightarrow H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S))$.)

Now let $\eta_0 \in Z_{\text{hom}}^n(X \times S)$ be a homologically trivial cycle supported on $X \times D$; $\text{im}(Hom_{\text{MHS}})$ should contain (and thus annihilate) the image of $AJ(\eta_0)$ under $J^n(X \times S) \rightarrow Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), W_{-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)))$. (Intuitively, this is why we quotient it out.) The delta-function current¹ $\delta_{\eta_0} \in Z_d([F^n] \mathcal{D}_{(X \times S)^\infty}^{2n})$

¹See [GH, Ja1] for discussion of currents.

has two primitives: $\omega \in \Gamma(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_{(X \times S)^\infty}^{2n-1})$ and $-\delta_{\mathcal{K}}$, $\mathcal{K} \in C_{2t+1}^{top}(X \times S)$ a C^∞ chain. Their restrictions (j^*) to $X \times \eta_S$ are d-closed, and give classes in $F^n W_{2n} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C})$ and $W_{2n} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q})$ (resp.); but $\omega + \delta_{\mathcal{K}}$ is closed on $X \times S$, and thus has class in $W_{2n-1} H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{C})$. So $j^*[\omega + \delta_{\mathcal{K}}] \in \text{im}(\text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}})$, on the one hand. But the image of $[\omega + \delta_{\mathcal{K}}] \in H^{2n-1}(X \times S)$ in $J^n(X \times S) \cong \{F^{t+1} H^{2t+1}(X \times S, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee / (\text{periods})$ is just $[\int_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot)]$ (where $\partial \mathcal{K} = \eta_0$), which is Griffiths' prescription for $AJ(\eta_0)$.

Now $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ is a class in the middle term of the short-exact sequence

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^i(\eta_S, R^{2n-i} \pi_{S*} \mathbb{Q}(n))) & = & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H} g^n(X \times \eta_S) \\ & \uparrow p & \\ & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) & \\ & \uparrow q & \\ \frac{\text{Ext}_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), W_{-1} H^{i-1}(\eta_S, R^{2n-i} \pi_{S*} \mathbb{Q}(n)))}{\text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), Gr_0^W H^{i-1}(\eta_S, R^{2n-i} \pi_{S*} \mathbb{Q}(n)))} & = & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S), \end{array}$$

where the $R^{2n-i} \pi_{S*} \mathbb{Q}(n) \cong H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ are constant sheaves.

Remark. [L2] has $\text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), Gr_0^W H^{2n-1}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)))$ in the bottom left-hand denominator of (4.5); our simplification follows easily from the Künneth decomposition of $H^*(X \times \eta_S)$ and purity of $H^*(X)$.

Define $[\zeta]_i := p(\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z}))$, and if this is zero $[AJ\zeta]_{i-1} := q^{-1}(\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z}))$. These should be thought of intuitively as “Leray graded pieces” of the cycle/ AJ -classes of the spread. One may take this statement literally for $[\zeta]_i$, but not for $[AJ\zeta]_i$ since $[AJ\zeta]$ may not be defined (unless all $[\zeta]_j$, and thus $[\zeta]$, are zero). In fact, for $[\zeta]_i$ to be defined, one need only have $[\zeta]_0 = \cdots = [\zeta]_{i-1} = 0$ (not $\Psi_0(\mathcal{Z}) = \cdots = \Psi_{i-1}(\mathcal{Z}) = 0$).

One may also think of $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ as a “higher normal function”, namely an $H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$ -valued $(i-1)$ -current on S , with infinitesimal invariant (i -current) $[\zeta]_i$. If this is zero then the resulting closed $(i-1)$ -current yields $[AJ\zeta]_{i-1}$; see (10.4). Moreover, in §11 [remark (11.4)] it is shown that an image of $[\zeta]_i$ identifies with the i^{th} Mumford invariant of S. Saito.

Remark 4.2. Lewis proves (4.4) and (4.5) with η_S everywhere replaced by an affine open $U \subseteq S$ with $S \setminus U$ a NCD, and $\underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}$ replaced by the image of $\Phi_{S,U} : H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times U, \mathbb{Q}(n))$. For the η_S -versions, it is enough to show that the NCD condition can be removed (then take a limit). If $S \setminus U$ is not a NCD, an embedded resolution (as in proof of Prop. 3.3) yields $\hat{S} \xrightarrow{b} S$, $(\hat{S} \setminus b^{-1}(U)) \cong U$ a NCD, and $H^*(\hat{S}) \xrightarrow{b_*} H^*(S)$. Using the Künneth decomposition and the short-exact sequence for $H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}$ in (4.3), $H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times$

$\hat{S}, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow{b_*^{\mathcal{P}}} H_{\mathcal{P}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$; and so $\Phi_{S,U} \circ b_*^{\mathcal{P}} = \Phi_{\hat{S},U} \implies \text{im}(\Phi_{S,U}) = \text{im}(\Phi_{\hat{S},U})$. Everything else in the U -versions of (4.4 – 5) is intrinsic to U , so we are done.

5. SOME SPECIAL CASES

Now we shall compute the terms of (4.5) for $i = 0, 1$ and determine the corresponding invariants (to be continued for $i \geq 2$ in §§10ff). For $i = 0$ one has (tacitly twisting by $(-n)$), since $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{-1} \underline{J}^n = 0$,

$$0 \rightarrow Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^0 \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow[p]{\cong} \underline{H}^0(\eta_S, Hg^n(X)),$$

where $Hg^n(X)$ is regarded as constant sheaf. Now $\Psi_0(\mathcal{Z})$ is the function $\eta_S \rightarrow Hg^n(X)$ given by $s \mapsto [\mathcal{Z}_s]$; since $\Psi_0(\mathcal{Z}) = p^{-1}[\zeta]_0$, it must be constant (this we owe essentially to rigidity of H_{DR}^*) and equal to $[\mathcal{Z}_{s_0}] = [\mathcal{Z}]$. So $\Psi_0(\mathcal{Z}) = [\mathcal{Z}]$ and $\mathcal{L}^1 CH^n(X_k) = CH_{\text{hom}}^n(X_k)$.

Next consider $i = 1$: noting that the Hom -denominator in the left-hand term is zero (as $Gr_1^W H^0(\eta_S) = 0$), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{H}^0(\eta_S, J^n(X)) &\xrightarrow{q} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \\ &\xrightarrow{p} F^n(\underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^{2n-1}(X, \mathbb{C})) \cap (\underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-1}(X, \mathbb{Q})). \end{aligned}$$

Write $V := H^{2n-1}(X, \mathbb{C}) \supseteq H^{2n-1}(X, \mathbb{Q}) =: \Lambda$, and note that $V = F^{n-1}V$, $J^n(X) = \frac{F^{n-1}V}{F^n V + \Lambda}$. As will be clear from §11 (using (11.1) together with the observation that $\chi_1 = \Psi_1$), $\Psi_1(\mathcal{Z})$ is the holomorphic function $\sigma : \eta_S \rightarrow J^n(X)$ given by $s \mapsto AJ(\mathcal{Z}_s)$. This lifts to a *discontinuous* function $\eta_S \rightarrow V$, that is, a V -valued 0-current $\tilde{\sigma} \in \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_S^0(V))$. Indeed, $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$ may be identified with

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{\ker \left\{ \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_S^0(V)) \xrightarrow{d} \frac{Z(' \mathcal{D}_S^1(V))}{Z(C_{2t-1}^S(\Lambda)) + Z(F^n ' \mathcal{D}_S^1(V))} \right\}}{\Gamma(C_{2t}^S(\Lambda)) + \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_S^0(F^n V))},$$

where $C_*^S(\Lambda)$ are (sheafified) Λ -valued C^∞ $*$ -chains, $Z(\cdot)$ means closed sections, and $F^n ' \mathcal{D}_S^1(V) = ' \mathcal{D}_S^1(F^n V) + F_S^1 ' \mathcal{D}_S^1(V)$. (Holomorphicity of $\sigma \implies d[\tilde{\sigma}]$ has no $\frac{F_S^0}{F_S^1} ' \mathcal{D}_S^1(\frac{V}{F^n V})$ component.) Hence $d[\tilde{\sigma}] = c + \omega$ gives classes $[c] \in \underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-1}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and $[-\omega] \in F^n(\underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^{2n-1}(X, \mathbb{C}))$ which are equivalent, hence the “ $\cap$ ”, hence $[\zeta]_1 = [-\omega] = [c]$. If this class is zero, modifying $\tilde{\sigma}$ by primitives in the denominator of (5.1) yields $' \tilde{\sigma}$ with $d[' \tilde{\sigma}] = 0$, thus a constant function from $\eta_S \rightarrow V$ *also lifting* σ . So $AJ(\mathcal{Z}_s) = AJ(\mathcal{Z}_{s_0})$ (for all $s \in \eta_S$),

and $\Psi_1(\mathcal{Z})$ lifts to $AJ(\mathcal{Z}) \in \underline{H}^0(\eta_S, J^n(X))$. Conclusion: if $[\zeta]_1 = 0$ then $[AJ\zeta]_0$ is defined and $= AJ(\mathcal{Z})$.

On the other hand, $AJ(\mathcal{Z})$ is defined whether or not $[\zeta]_1 = 0$, and so it is a nontrivial question to ask:

if $AJ(\mathcal{Z}_{(s_0)}) = 0$, must $AJ(\mathcal{Z}_s) = 0$ for all s ?

While the $\{\mathcal{Z}_s\}$ are algebraically isomorphic, they have different transcendental geometry, and $AJ(\mathcal{Z}_s)$ is an invariant of that geometry. That the answer is yes, should be considered fortunate; the same question for m -cycles ($m > 0$) is open. (The answer is expected to be affirmative for cycles algebraically equivalent to zero. This is consistent with the case of 0-cycles, since all 0-cycles are $\stackrel{\text{alg}}{=} 0$.)

A statement obviously equivalent to the affirmative answer for 0-cycles, which we now prove, reads: $AJ(\mathcal{Z}) = 0 \implies \Psi_1(\zeta) = 0$.

Proof. We temporarily write “ $Alb(X)$ ” for $J^n(X)$ and “ Alb ” for AJ , to agree with notation in [M] (AJ will be written only for curves).

While Alb -equivalence does not spread *a priori*, rational equivalence is algebraic and *does*. For 0-cycles on curves, $AJ(\mathcal{W}) = 0 \implies \mathcal{W} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{=} 0$, so we want to factor a correspondence giving the identity on $Alb(X)$ through a curve. This is done in [M]; namely, there exists a smooth curve $C/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq X$ and correspondence ${}^t\tilde{E} \in CH^1(X \times C/\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ so that the top (and $\therefore$ bottom) compositions in the following diagram are isomorphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
Alb(X) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & J(C) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Alb(X) \\
\uparrow Alb & & \uparrow \cong \quad AJ & & \uparrow Alb \\
\mathcal{L}^1CH^n(X_k) & \xrightarrow{{}^t\tilde{E}} & \mathcal{L}^1CH^1(C_k) & \xrightarrow{\iota_C} & \mathcal{L}^1CH^n(X_k) \\
\downarrow \Psi_1 & & \downarrow \Psi_1 & & \downarrow \Psi_1 \\
Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S) & \xrightarrow{[{}^t\tilde{E} \times \Delta_S]^*} & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(C \times \eta_S) & \xrightarrow{[\iota_C \times \Delta_S]^*} & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S) \\
& \xrightarrow{\quad \cong \quad} & & &
\end{array}$$

(where we are identifying $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S)$ with [holomorphic] functions from $\eta_S \rightarrow Alb(X)$). So given $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^1CH^n(X_k)$ with $Alb(\mathcal{Z}) = 0$, one traces through the diagram to see ${}^t\tilde{E} \cdot \mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{=} 0 \implies \Psi_1({}^t\tilde{E} \cdot \mathcal{Z}) = 0 \implies \Psi_1(\iota_C \cdot {}^t\tilde{E} \cdot \mathcal{Z}) = 0 \implies \Psi_1(\mathcal{Z}) = 0$.

[Geometrically speaking, applying ${}^t\tilde{E} \times \Delta_S$ to ζ turns the family $\{\mathcal{Z}_s\}$ into a family $\{'\mathcal{Z}_s\}$ of 0-cycles supported on C , with $\text{Alb}_X('Z_s) = \text{Alb}_X(\mathcal{Z}_s)$ ($\forall s$). Now $\text{Alb}_X(\mathcal{Z}_{s_0}) = 0 \implies AJ_C('Z_{s_0}) = 0 \implies 'Z_{s_0} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv} 0 \implies 'Z_s \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv} 0 \implies \text{Alb}_X('Z_s) = 0 \implies \text{Alb}_X(\mathcal{Z}_s) = 0.$] $\square$

Remark. (i) $\frac{1}{n}\iota_C \cdot {}^t\tilde{E} \in CH^n(X \times X)$ is called the Albanese projector.
(ii) Owing to the last result we shall call the Ψ_i “higher Abel-Jacobi maps”.

6. RELATION TO THE WORK OF GRIFFITHS AND GREEN

We want to point out the equivalence of the approach taken here (based on work of Lewis) with that taken in [GG3], which considers graded pieces of $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta})$ (modulo ambiguities) in lieu of $c_{\mathcal{H}}(\zeta) [= \Psi(\mathcal{Z})]$. (This uses a Leray filtration on $H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$; see the discussion in §10.) What we do here is briefly explain, in parallel with the discussion of termination of $\mathcal{L}^\bullet$ in §3, why the Griffiths-Green approach also leads to a filtration $\mathcal{F}_{GG}^\bullet$ on CH^n that terminates at (or before) the $(n+1)^{\text{st}}$ step. A complete proof (modulo HC) of the equivalence of $\mathcal{F}_{GG}^\bullet$ and $\mathcal{L}^\bullet$ has appeared in [mS, sec. 1.6] for X defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.

A cycle $\mathcal{Z} \in CH^n(X_k)$ lies in $\mathcal{F}_{GG}^i$ if there *exists* a choice of complete $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -spread $\bar{\zeta}$ such that $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}) \in \mathcal{L}_S^i H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$. In order to exhibit the termination property $\mathcal{F}_{GG}^{n+1} = \mathcal{F}_{GG}^{n+k}$ for all $k > 0$, the following will suffice: given $\bar{\zeta} \in Z^n(X \times S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ with $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}) \in \mathcal{L}_S^{n+1} H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}$, we must produce $\Gamma_D \in Z^n(X \times D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ (for some divisor $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq S$) such that $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta} - \Gamma_D) = 0$.

The construction of this Γ_D involves the Hodge conjecture (HC), which never explicitly appears in Lewis; that is because it is absorbed into BBC^q (in fact, $\text{HC} + \text{BBC} \implies \text{BBC}^q$). That is, in the Lewis approach it is a longer leap from vanishing of the invariant ($c_{\mathcal{H}}(\zeta) = 0$) to rational equivalence ($\zeta \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv} 0$), while in the Griffiths-Green approach vanishing of the invariant ($c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}) = 0$) is harder.

One produces Γ_D one bit at a time (modifying $\bar{\zeta}$ as we go), first picking off $[\bar{\zeta}]_{n+1}$ thru $[\bar{\zeta}]_{2n}$, then (since now $\bar{\zeta}' \stackrel{\text{hom}}{\equiv} 0$) $[AJ(\bar{\zeta}')]_n$ thru $[AJ(\bar{\zeta}')]_{2n-1}$. As the idea is the same for each of these, we just demonstrate it (for one of the $[\bar{\zeta}]_{n+i}$) in an example.

For this example, we take X to be a 3-fold ($\mathcal{Z}$ a 0-cycle as usual), and of course $Gr_{\mathcal{L}_S}^0 c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}) = \dots = Gr_{\mathcal{L}_S}^3 c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}) = 0$. We take aim at $[\bar{\zeta}]_4$, the graded piece of the fundamental class of $\bar{\zeta}$ in

$$Hg^3(X \times S) \cap \{H^2(X) \otimes H^4(S)\}.$$

The idea is to take a “cross-section” of $\bar{\zeta}$ by a hyperplane section $X_{\mathbf{H}}$ of X defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$; $\bar{\zeta} \cap (X_{\mathbf{H}} \times S)$ is then supported on $X_{(\mathbf{H})} \times D$ for some codim.-1

$D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq S$. This cross-section map may be formulated as a correspondence

$$\langle \mathbf{H} \times \Delta_S \rangle \in CH^*((X \times S) \times (X \times S)),$$

so that the isomorphism of hard Lefschetz is induced by its action:

$$H^2(X) \otimes H^4(S) \xrightarrow[\cong]{[\mathbf{H} \times \Delta_S]_*} H^4(X) \otimes H^4(S).$$

According to the Lefschetz standard conjecture ($\Leftarrow$ HC + hard Lefschetz), there exists a correspondence $\langle \mathbf{H}^{-1} \rangle$ (algebraically) inducing its inverse (and inducing the zero map in other degrees²). That is, $[\mathbf{H}^{-1}]_* = ([\mathbf{H}]_*)^{-1}$, so the composition $[\mathbf{H}^{-1} \times \Delta_S]_* \circ [\mathbf{H} \times \Delta_S]_* = \text{id}$ on cohomology $H^2(X) \otimes H^4(S)$ (and zero on $H^i(X) \otimes H^{6-i}(S)$ for $i \neq 2$). But because it is “algebraic” (i.e. induced by a correspondence), the composition operates on cycles, and is *not* the identity on $\bar{\zeta}$. In particular, since already $\langle \mathbf{H} \times \Delta_S \rangle \cdot \bar{\zeta}$ is supported on $X \times D$,

$$\Gamma_D^4 := \langle \mathbf{H}^{-1} \times \Delta_S \rangle (\langle \mathbf{H} \times \Delta_S \rangle \cdot \bar{\zeta}) \subseteq X \times D.$$

As cohomology classes, though,

$$[\Gamma_D^4] = [\mathbf{H}^{-1} \times \Delta_S]_* \circ [\mathbf{H} \times \Delta_S]_* [\bar{\zeta}] = [\bar{\zeta}]_4 \in H^2(X) \otimes H^4(S)$$

and so the modification $\bar{\zeta} - \Gamma_D^4$ kills $Gr_{\mathcal{L}_S}^4$ of the fundamental class (of $\bar{\zeta}$) without affecting either the other $Gr_{\mathcal{L}_S}^i$ or the complete spread’s restriction to $\mathcal{Z} = \bar{\zeta} \cap (X \times \{s_0\})$ (or even to ζ). Griffiths and Green say such a class is “in the ambiguities”.

Part 2. Motivation via degenerate cases

7. FORMAL COMPUTATIONS FOR RELATIVE VARIETIES

The results of Part 1 are stated for X smooth projective $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. We now propose to apply them formally to 0-cycles on certain *relative quasiprojective* X . It turns out that the filtrations and maps they predict (for these special X) are correct, explicitly constructible, and give insight into the case of X projective – which we resume in Part 3.

Our first special $X = (\square_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^n, \partial \square_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^n)$, the “algebraic n -cube”, where $\square_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^n := (\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^1 \setminus \{1\})$ and $\partial \square_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^n := \bigcup_j \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \square_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^n \mid z_j = 0 \text{ or } \infty\}$. We consider 0-cycles $\mathcal{Z} \in CH^n(\square_k^n, \partial \square_k^n)$, $k \cong \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)$. We will write $(\square^n, \partial \square^n)$ for the corresponding analytic variety $/\mathbb{C}$, and $((\mathbb{C}^*)^n, \mathbb{I}^n)$ for the “dual” variety, where

²This is not part of the Lefschetz standard conjecture as such, but can be arranged without additional assumptions by [Kl].

$\mathbb{I}^n = \bigcup_j \{(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \mid z_j = 1\}$. (One can also think of these two as $(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{1\}, \{0, \infty\})^n$ and $(\mathbb{C}^*, \{1\})^n$.)

There is a perfect pairing

$$H^{2n-i}((\square^n, \partial \square^n), \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^i(((\mathbb{C}^*)^n, \mathbb{I}^n), \mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}(-n);$$

while

$$(7.1) \quad H^i(((\mathbb{C}^*)^n, \mathbb{I}^n), \mathbb{Q}) \cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{Q}(-n) & i = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

because $\left[\frac{1}{(2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n} d\log z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\log z_n \right]$ has weight $2n$ (due to the n dlog's; see e.g. [GS]). The $\mathbb{Q}(-n)$ must pair with a $\mathbb{Q}(0)$, and so (writing $\pi_S : X \times S \rightarrow S$ as above)

$$R^{2n-i}\pi_{S*}\mathbb{Q} \cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{Q}(0) & i = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \implies R^n\pi_{S*}\mathbb{Q}(n) = \mathbb{Q}(n).$$

We emphasize that this is highly peculiar; it has the effect of giving $H^*(\eta_S)$ where one would expect (were X smooth projective) $\underline{H}^*(\eta_S)$ in the Ψ_n -target which we now compute.

The mixed Hodge structure $H^{n-1}(\eta_S)$ has weights (in general) from $(n-1)$ to $2(n-1)$; therefore $H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ has weights from $-(n+1)$ to -2 so that W_{-1} is everything and $Gr_0^W = 0$. Similarly, $W_0 H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) = H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$. Applying this reasoning to (7.1) with $X = (\square^n, \partial \square^n)$, one has

$$Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq n,$$

$$Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^n \underline{H}g^n(X \times \eta_S) \cong Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))) \cong F^n H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \cap H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{n-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S) &\cong Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))) \cong \frac{H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C})}{F^n H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) + H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))} \\ &\cong H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}(n)). \end{aligned}$$

So the formalism predicts a map Ψ from $CH^n(\square_k^n, \partial \square_k^n)$ to the middle term of

$$(7.2) \quad H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow{q} H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow{p} F^n H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \cap H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)),$$

such that $p(\Psi(\mathcal{Z})) = [\zeta]$ (and if this is zero $\Psi(\mathcal{Z}) = q[AJ\zeta]$).

Next, in order to get a more interesting Leray filtration, we take $X = (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n$ – a product of “degenerate elliptic curves”. This serves as a transitional example between $(\square^n, \partial \square^n)$ and products of smooth projective curves.

For fixed i , let $\mathfrak{S}_i^n$ denote the set of strictly increasing functions $\sigma : \{1, \dots, i\} \hookrightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$, which we may also think of as a choice of i indices

$$1 \leq \sigma(1) \leq \dots \leq \sigma(i) \leq n;$$

obviously $|\mathfrak{S}_i^n| = \frac{n!}{(n-i)!i!}$. To each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n$ corresponds a projection

$$\pi_\sigma : (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^*)^i,$$

and these induce maps on cohomology (twisted to have weight 0)

$$H^i((\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\})^n, \mathbb{Q}(i)) \cong \oplus_\sigma \langle \wedge^\sigma \text{dlogz} \rangle \xleftarrow[\oplus_\sigma \pi_\sigma^*]{\cong} \oplus_\sigma H^i((\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\})^i, \mathbb{Q}(i))$$

where $\wedge^\sigma \text{dlogz} := \text{dlog} z_{\sigma(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \text{dlog} z_{\sigma(i)}$ and $\oplus_\sigma$ is short for $\oplus_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n}$.

Let $[\wedge^\sigma \text{dlogz}]^\vee$ be a functional evaluating (for each σ') to $\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}$ on $[\wedge^{\sigma'} \text{dlogz}]$; $\langle \wedge^\sigma \text{dlogz} \rangle^\vee$ will denote the $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector-space it generates. The last map dualizes to

$$(7.3) \quad H^{2n-i}((\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n, \mathbb{Q}(n-i)) \cong \oplus_\sigma \langle \wedge^\sigma \text{dlogz} \rangle^\vee \xrightarrow{\cong} \oplus_\sigma H^i((\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^i, \mathbb{Q})$$

(also weight 0) so that [for $X = (\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n$]

$$\begin{aligned} R^{2n-i} \pi_{S*} \mathbb{Q}(n) &\cong \mathbb{Q}(i) \otimes R^{2n-i} \pi_{S*} \mathbb{Q}(n-i) \cong \oplus_\sigma \mathbb{Q}(i) \otimes \langle \wedge^\sigma \text{dlogz} \rangle^\vee \\ &\cong \oplus_\sigma \mathbb{Q}(i). \end{aligned}$$

Twisted by $\mathbb{Q}(i)$, (7.3) induces the top $\cong$ in the following diagram, in which we are also (formally) applying functorial properties of the $\mathcal{L}^i$ (proved in [L2]):

$$(7.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}((\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \oplus_\sigma Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2i}((\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^i \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(i)) \\ \uparrow \Psi_i(n) & & \uparrow \oplus_\sigma \Psi_i(i) \\ \mathcal{L}^i CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n) & \xrightarrow{\oplus(\pi_\sigma)_*} & \oplus_\sigma \mathcal{L}^i CH^i((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^i). \end{array}$$

This says that $\Psi_i(n)$ factors through $\oplus_\sigma(\pi_\sigma)_*$; combining this with the expectation that $\Psi_i(i)$ is injective, we have formally that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{i+1} CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n) &= \ker(\Psi_i(n)) = \ker\{\oplus_\sigma(\pi_\sigma)_*\} \\ &= \left\{ \langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \mid (\pi_\sigma)_* \mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv} 0 \ (\forall \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

consists of 0-cycles whose projections to “ i -faces” $(\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^i$ are rationally equivalent to zero. This obviously *does* give a filtration, and we expect maps

$$(7.5) \quad \Psi_i : Gr_{\ell}^i CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n) \longrightarrow H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(i)) \otimes \{H^i((\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\})^n, \mathbb{Q}(i))\}^{\vee}$$

(or equivalently, to $\oplus_{\sigma} H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(i))$) by a calculation similar to that done above for $(\square^n, \partial \square^n)$.

8. ENTER THE MILNOR REGULATOR

We now explain how maps agreeing with the predictions of §7 are obtained; we remind the reader that all Chow, cycle, and K -groups are $\otimes \mathbb{Q}$ (modulo torsion).

Let $\mathbb{Z}\{\mathcal{S}\} :=$ the free abelian group on the set $\mathcal{S}$, and $\mathbb{Q}\{\mathcal{S}\} := \mathbb{Z}\{\mathcal{S}\} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. The map

$$\otimes^n \mathbb{Q}\{k^*\} \longrightarrow Z^n(\square_k^n, \partial \square_k^n) \quad [\{\mathbf{a}\} := a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n \mapsto (a_1, \dots, a_n) =: (\mathbf{a})]$$

descends to an isomorphism (taking the quotient by Steinberg relations $\otimes \mathbb{Q}$ on the left and rational equivalences $\otimes \mathbb{Q}$ on the right)

$$K_n^M(k) \xrightarrow[\Xi]{\cong} CH^n(\square_k^n, \partial \square_k^n) \quad [\{\mathbf{a}\} := \{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \mapsto \langle (a_1, \dots, a_n) \rangle].$$

Remark. By normalization of Bloch's higher Chow complex, this reduces to $K_n^M(k) \cong CH^n(\text{Spec } k, n)$; proof of the latter (the essential step is Suslin reciprocity) may be found in [T].

Suppose $(\forall i) f_i \mapsto a_i$ (i.e. $\mathbf{f} \mapsto \mathbf{a}$) under the embedding $e : \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \xrightarrow{\cong} k[\subseteq \mathbb{C}]$ given by evaluation at $0 \in \eta_S$, and let $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathbf{a}) = (e(\mathbf{f}))$. Then $\bar{\zeta}$ is the graph [closure] of $f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_n$ over S , $\bar{\gamma}_{\mathbf{f}} \subseteq Z^n((\square_{\mathbb{Q}}^n, \partial \square_{\mathbb{Q}}^n) \times S)$. Writing $\gamma_{\mathbf{f}} = \zeta$ for its restriction to $(\square_{\mathbb{Q}}^n, \partial \square_{\mathbb{Q}}^n) \times \eta_S$, the spread map

$$CH^n(\square_k^n, \partial \square_k^n) \xrightarrow{\cong} CH^n((\square_{\mathbb{Q}}^n, \partial \square_{\mathbb{Q}}^n) \times \eta_S)$$

sends $[\langle (\mathbf{a}) \rangle] = [\langle (e(\mathbf{f})) \rangle] \mapsto \langle \gamma_{\mathbf{f}} \rangle$.

Lemma 8.1. [Kel] *There exists a regulator map*

$$\mathcal{R} : K_n^M(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$$

such that (referring to (7.2)) $p(\mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\}) = [\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}]$ and (if this is zero) $q(AJ(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}})) = \mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\}$, for suitable determinations of $[\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}] \in F^n H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \cap H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ and $AJ(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}) \in H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}(n))$.

If we assume this, taking $\Psi := \mathcal{R} \circ e^{-1} \circ \Xi^{-1}$ makes good on our prediction from §7, since then (for $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathbf{a}) = (e(\mathbf{f}))$)

$$(p \circ \Psi)(\mathcal{Z}) = p((\mathcal{R} \circ e^{-1})\{\mathbf{a}\}) = p(\mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\}) = [\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}] = [\zeta],$$

and so on.

We briefly (and somewhat roughly) summarize the computation of $[\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}]$ and $AJ(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}})$ involved in the construction of $\mathcal{R}$ (from [Kel]). The idea is that $\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ gives a topological $2t$ -cycle essentially on $(\mathbb{C}^*, \{1\})^n \times S_{rel}$, where $S_{rel} := \varinjlim_{D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq S} (S, D)$. Moreover each $(\mathbb{C}^*, \{1\})$ factor has a fundamental domain $(\mathbb{D}, \{1\})$ obtained by cutting along $\mathbb{R}^-$, endowed with a C^∞ homotopy $\theta : \mathbb{D} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ contracting $\mathbb{D}$ to $\{1\}$. One may lift $\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ to $\tilde{\gamma}_{\mathbf{f}}$ on $(\mathbb{D}, \{1\})^n \times S_{rel}$, then “successively” contract $(\mathbb{D}, \{1\})$ -factors. Under *this* “total homotopy” $\tilde{\gamma}_{\mathbf{f}}$ traces out a $(2t + 1)$ -chain $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ (on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n \times S$) with $\partial\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}} \equiv \gamma_{\mathbf{f}} - (S^1)^n \times T_{\mathbf{f}}$, where $T_{\mathbf{f}} := \pi_S \{\gamma_{\mathbf{f}} \cap (\mathbb{R}^- \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^-) \times S\}$. (We ignore the rest of the boundary, in particular that supported on $S_{rel} \times \mathbb{I}^n$.)

Now write $\Omega_n := \wedge^n \text{dlog} \mathbf{z} = \frac{dz_1}{z_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{dz_n}{z_n}$; this generates cohomology of $(\mathbb{C}^*, \{1\})^n$. We may define the fundamental class of $\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ as a functional

$$[\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}] := \left[\int_{\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}} \Omega_n \wedge \pi_S^*(\cdot) \right] \in \{H^{2t-n}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee \cong H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}),$$

which identifies with [integration³ on S against] the holomorphic current $\wedge^n \text{dlog} \mathbf{f} =: \Omega_{\mathbf{f}}$ or equivalently (using $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ and Stokes’ theorem) $(2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n \delta_{T_{\mathbf{f}}}$. We write

$$[\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}] = [\Omega_{\mathbf{f}}] = [(2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n \delta_{T_{\mathbf{f}}}] \in F^n H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \cap H^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)).$$

If this class vanishes then $T_{\mathbf{f}} = \partial\mu$ (μ a $(2t - n + 1)$ -chain $\otimes \mathbb{Q}$) and $\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f}} := \Gamma_{\mathbf{f}} + (S^1)^n \times \mu \implies \partial\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f}} \equiv \gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$. Accounting for ambiguity in choice of μ , define

$$AJ(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}) := \left[\int_{\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f}}} \Omega_n \wedge \pi_S^*(\cdot) \right] \in \frac{\{H^{2t-n+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee}{\text{im}\{H_{2t-n+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{Q}(n))\}} \cong H^{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}(n)).$$

It is computed by the Milnor-regulator current $R_{\mathbf{f}} + (2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n \delta_\mu =: R'_{\mathbf{f}} \in Z_d(\mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^{n-1})$, where

$$R_{\mathbf{f}} := \sum_{j=1}^n (\pm 2\pi\sqrt{-1})^j \log f_j \text{dlog} f_{j-1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \text{dlog} f_n \cdot \delta_{T_{f_1} \cap \cdots \cap T_{f_{j-1}}}$$

(and $T_f := f^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^-)$, $\pm := (-1)^{n-1}$). We prefer to view $R'_{\mathbf{f}}$ as a $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}(n)$ -valued functional on topological $(n - 1)$ -cycles ($\otimes \mathbb{Q}$) avoiding D (rather than forms

³(e.g., of forms compactly supported away from some D in the limit)

compactly supported away from D). This allows us to discard the membrane term. Finally, a technical point: to completely describe $\mathcal{R}$ (and thus Ψ) one needs a Deligne-homology description of $H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$, or the description below in §9; then (see [KLM, Sect. 5.9]) we put $\mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\} = ((2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n T_{\mathbf{f}}, \Omega_{\mathbf{f}}, R_{\mathbf{f}})$. In terms of our formal analogy to the theory of Part 1 and the $\cong$'s of §7, we have the following

Conclusion. If $\mathcal{Z} = (e(f_1), \dots, e(f_n)) \in Z^n(\square_k^n, \partial\square_k^n)$, then

$$[\zeta]_n = [\Omega_{\mathbf{f}}] = [(2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n T_{\mathbf{f}}] \in Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^n \underline{H}g^n((\square^n, \partial\square^n) \times \eta_S),$$

and if this vanishes

$$[AJ\zeta]_{n-1} = [R_{\mathbf{f}}] \in Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{n-1} \underline{J}^n((\square^n, \partial\square^n) \times \eta_S);$$

in other words $\Psi(\mathcal{Z}) = \mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\}$.

Remark 8.2. (i) There is a natural generalization of this to higher-dimensional cycles on the n -cube, to the effect that the one nontrivial higher AJ map $\Psi (= \Psi_{2p-n})$ is computed by the composition

$$CH^p(\square_k^n, \partial\square_k^n) \xrightarrow[\Xi^{-1}]{\cong} CH^p(\text{Spec } k, n) \xrightarrow[e^{-1}]{\cong} CH^p(\eta_S, n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2p-n}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(p))$$

where $\mathcal{R}$ are the AJ maps of [KLM]. (See [Ke3] for examples.)

(ii) The isomorphism $\Xi : K_n^M(\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{\cong} CH^n(\square^n, \partial\square^n)$ (where we have taken the limit over $k \subset \mathbb{C}$) gives a concrete demonstration of the Mumford(-Roitman) theorem, since the map $\pi_N : S^{(N)}((\mathbb{C}^*)^{\times n}) \rightarrow K_n^M(\mathbb{C})$ fails to surject for all N (there are always elements of $K_n^M(\mathbb{C})$ that cannot be presented as a sum of $\leq N$ symbols). A warning in this connection: that $K_n^M(\mathbb{C})[\otimes \mathbb{Q}]$ is an ∞ -dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector-space is irrelevant (as such), since the ∞ -dimensionality which interests us is essentially $/\mathbb{C}$. After all, the Jacobian of any curve ($g \geq 1$) contains $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector-spaces of arbitrarily high dimension; simply choose algebraically independent generators $\in \mathbb{C}^g$ (which are also independent of the period vectors)!

We give a more terse description of the Ψ_i for $X = (\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n$, starting with Ψ_n . First recall $\mathcal{L}^i CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n) := \left\{ \langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \mid (\pi_{\sigma})_* \mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv} 0 \ (\forall \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{i-1}^n) \right\}$.

Lemma 8.3. $\mathcal{L}^n CH^n$ is spanned by n -box cycles of the form

$$\mathcal{Z} = B(\mathbf{a}) = B(a_1, \dots, a_n) := ((a_1) - (1)) \times \dots \times ((a_n) - (1)),$$

$a_i \in k^*$. The map $\Xi_n : K_n^M(k) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^n CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n)$ given by $\{\mathbf{a}\} \mapsto \langle B(\mathbf{a}) \rangle$, is an isomorphism with inverse sending $\langle \mathbf{a} \rangle \mapsto \{\mathbf{a}\}$ (since all symbols involving a “1” are trivial in Milnor K -theory).

Example. The 2-box cycle $B(a_1, a_2) = (a_1, a_2) - (1, a_2) - (a_1, 1) + (1, 1)$. Cycles of this form generate the Albanese kernel in $CH^2(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\} \times \mathbb{P}^1 \cup \mathbb{P}^1 \times \{0, \infty\})$.

Proof. (of Lemma): See [Ke3]; here we just point out why Ξ_n surjects. Using the norm in Milnor K -theory, one can modify $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^n CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n)$ by a rational equivalence so that the coordinates of its points lie in k^* (rather than some algebraic extension). Then one uses the fact that its face projections are rationally equivalent to zero to get $\mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv} \mathcal{Z} + \sum_{j < n} (-1)^{n-j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_j^n} (\tilde{\pi}_\sigma)_* \mathcal{Z} = B(\mathcal{Z})$. Here $\tilde{\pi}_\sigma : (\mathbb{C}^*)^n \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ denotes the internal projection corresponding to π_σ ; e.g., if $\pi_\sigma(z_1, \dots, z_5) = (z_1, z_4, z_5)$ then $\tilde{\pi}_\sigma(z_1, \dots, z_5) = (z_1, 1, 1, z_4, z_5)$. $\square$

An n -box cycle $\mathcal{Z} = B(e(\mathbf{f}))$ spreads to an n -box graph $\zeta = B(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}) \in Z^n((\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n \times \eta_S)$; one checks that $[\zeta]_0 = \dots = [\zeta]_{n-1} = 0$ and $[\zeta] = [\zeta]_n$ is computed by $[\Omega_{\mathbf{f}}]$. Using homotopies one constructs a topological chain $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}^B$ having $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ as a component, which satisfies $\partial \Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}^B = B(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}) - (S^1)^n \times T_{\mathbf{f}}$. (Here we do *not* ignore boundary at $\mathbb{I}^n \times S_{\text{rel}}$, since this is $B(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}) \setminus \gamma_{\mathbf{f}}!$) As before one computes $AJ(B(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}))$ (if $[\zeta] = 0$) by integrating $\int_{\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}^B} \Omega_n \wedge \pi_S^*(\cdot)$ (plus membrane term); but as the only nonzero contribution comes from $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$, $[AJ(B(\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}))]_{n-1}$ is just given by $[R_{\mathbf{f}}]$ after all. See [Ke3] for details.

So for $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle = \Xi_n(e\{\mathbf{f}\}) \in \mathcal{L}^n CH^n$, $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta) = \mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\}$; and we write Ψ_n for the composition

$$\mathcal{L}^n CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n) \xrightarrow[\Xi_n^{-1}]{\cong} K_n^M(k) \xrightarrow[e^{-1}]{\cong} K_n^M(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)).$$

To construct the remaining “ Ψ_i ”, we need the following

Lemma 8.4. (i) $\mathcal{L}^i CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n)$ is generated by “ i -box” cycles of the form

$$((a_1) - (1)) \times \dots \times ((a_i) - (1)) \times (a_{i+1}) \times \dots \times (a_n)$$

(written in any order), where the $a_j \in k^*$.

$$(ii) \text{ } Gr^i CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n) \xrightarrow[\oplus_{\sigma(\pi_\sigma)_*}]{\cong} \oplus_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n} K_i^M(k). \text{ [The above “} i\text{-box” would}$$

be sent to $\{a_1, \dots, a_i\}$ in one $\oplus$ -factor, 0 in the others.]

Proof. keys are Suslin reciprocity (in the form proved in [Ke2]), some combinatorial considerations (see [Ke3]), and a norm argument. $\square$

Now consider the composition

$$Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i CH^n((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^n) \xrightarrow[\cong]{\oplus(\pi_i^\sigma)_*} \oplus_{\sigma} \mathcal{L}^i CH^i((\mathbb{P}_k^1, \{0, \infty\})^i)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\oplus(\mathcal{R} \circ e^{-1} \circ \Xi_i^{-1})} \oplus_{\sigma} H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(i));$$

one can argue (by combining a diagram like (7.4) with the argument for Ψ_n) that on cycles of the form described in Lemma 8.4(i), this computes the i^{th} Leray component of $c_{\mathcal{D}}$ of the spread. We label this Ψ_i , with the caveat that one needs injectivity of $\mathcal{R}$ [=BBC in this context] to get $\ker(\Psi_i) = \mathcal{L}^{i+1} CH^n$. Referring to (7.5), we can be more precise and write

$$(8.1) \quad \Psi_i(\mathcal{Z}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n} \mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}_{\sigma}\} \otimes [\wedge^{\sigma} d\log \mathbf{z}]^{\vee} \in H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(i)) \otimes \{H^i((\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus 0, \infty)^n, \mathbb{Q}(i))\}^{\vee},$$

where $\{\mathbf{f}_{\sigma}\} = (e^{-1} \circ \Xi_i^{-1} \circ (\pi_{\sigma})_*) \langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle$.

Remark 8.5. BBC on X (*not* to be confused with injectivity of $\mathcal{R}$!) means that $\mathcal{L}^2 CH^n(X_k)$ should be zero when $k = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Lemma 8.4(ii) shows that this holds for $X = (\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n$ since $K_i^M(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = 0$ for $i \geq 2$ (see [R]).

9. INTERPRETATION VIA DIFFERENTIAL CHARACTERS

We return to the case $X = (\square_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^n, \partial \square_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^n)$, with $\mathcal{Z} = (e(\mathbf{f})) \in Z^n(X_k)$ and $\zeta = \gamma_{\mathbf{f}} \in Z^n(X \times \eta_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$. Up to this point we have presented $\mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\} = \Psi(\mathcal{Z}) = c_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{Z}) \in H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ as an algebraic means of collecting $[\Omega_{\mathbf{f}}] = [\zeta]$ and $[R_{\mathbf{f}}] = AJ(\zeta)$ into a single object. We now give a geometric description of this object. In what follows, D refers to some codimension-1 subvariety $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset S$ (in the limit defining η_S and S_{rel}); when dealing with $\gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$, $R_{\mathbf{f}}$, etc. it is assumed that $D \supseteq \cup |f_i|$.

A (holomorphic) differential $(n-1)$ -character on $S \setminus D$ is for us a functional on cycles $\mathcal{C} \in Z_{n-1}^{top}(S \setminus D)$ with the following property: when $\mathcal{C} = \partial \mu$ on $S \setminus D$ (i.e., μ is compactly supported away from D), the functional reduces to a membrane integral $\int_{\mu} \Omega$ (for some holomorphic form Ω on $S \setminus D$). The group $H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ can be described in terms of currents as

$$(9.1) \quad \frac{\ker \left\{ \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^{n-1}) \xrightarrow{d} \frac{Z(' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^n)}{Z(F^n ' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^n) + Z(C_{2t-n}^{S_{rel}}(\mathbb{Q}(n)))} \right\}}{d\Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^{n-2}) + \Gamma(C_{2t-n+1}^{S_{rel}}(\mathbb{Q}(n)))}.$$

(Here $' \mathcal{D}_{S \setminus D}^* := ' \mathcal{D}_S^* / \{\text{currents supported on } D\}$; while $C_*^{(S,D)} := C_*^S / \{\text{chains supported on } D\}$.) Thus a current R representing a class in $H_{\mathcal{D}}^n$ satisfies $d[R] \equiv \Omega + (2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n \delta_{\mathcal{K}}$ (on $S \setminus D$, i.e. modulo currents supported on D). Such an $\int_{(\cdot)} R$ defines a $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}(n)$ -valued differential character, since $\int_{\partial\mu} R = \int_{\mu} \Omega + (2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n \#(\mu \cap \mathcal{K}) \equiv \int_{\mu} \Omega \pmod{\mathbb{Q}(n)}$.

Proposition 9.1. *The current $R_{\mathbf{f}}$ computes the class $\mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\} \in H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$.*

Proof. That $R_{\mathbf{f}}$ numerator of (9.1) follows from $d[R_{\mathbf{f}}] = \Omega_{\mathbf{f}} - (2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n \delta_{T_{\mathbf{f}}}$ (on η_S). In the Deligne homology description of $H_{\mathcal{D}}^n(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$, essentially⁴

$$\frac{\ker \left\{ Z \left(C_{2t-n}^{S_{rel}}(\mathbb{Q}(n)) \right) \oplus Z(F^n ' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^n) \oplus \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^{n-1}) \xrightarrow{D} Z(' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^n) \right\}}{\text{im} \left\{ \Gamma \left(C_{2t-n+1}^{S_{rel}}(\mathbb{Q}(n)) \right) \oplus \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_{\eta_S}^{n-2}) \xrightarrow{D} \text{num} \right\}},$$

$\mathcal{R}\{\mathbf{f}\}$ is taken to be the class defined by $((2\pi i)^n T_{\mathbf{f}}, \Omega_{\mathbf{f}}, R_{\mathbf{f}})$. But this description maps isomorphically to (9.1) simply by sending (T, Ω, R) [in the numerator] to R . $\square$

There is a more interesting perspective on why $R_{\mathbf{f}}$ gives a differential character. Given $\mathcal{C} \in Z_{n-1}^{\text{top}}(S \setminus D)$, write $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{C})$ for the $(n-1)$ -cycle $\rho_X(\rho_S^{-1}(\mathcal{C}))$ on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. (This $\mathbf{f}(\cdot)$ is actually defined on any element of $C_*^{\text{top}}(S \setminus D)$, chains compactly supported away from D . One should note in analogy to Remark 2.1, that $\rho_X \circ (\rho_S)^{-1}$ really means $\sum_i m_i \rho_X^i \circ (\rho_S^i)^{-1}$.)

Claim. $\exists \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \in C_n^{\text{top}}((\mathbb{C}^*)^n)$ such that $\partial \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \equiv \mathbf{f}(\mathcal{C}) \pmod{\mathbb{I}^n}$, and $\int_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}} \wedge^n d\log \mathbf{z} \equiv \int_{\mathcal{C}} R_{\mathbf{f}} \pmod{\mathbb{Q}(n)}$. [Note that changing the choice of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ (by a cycle) only alters $\int_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}} \Omega_n$ by $\mathbb{Q}(n)$.]

In other words, $\int_{\mathcal{C}} R_{\mathbf{f}}$ can always be computed by a membrane integral, only on X (rather than η_S). The claim is key to understanding how the form $\wedge^n d\log \mathbf{z} = \Omega_n$ (and thus $H^n(X)$) controls rational equivalence. Assuming it, if $\mathcal{C} = \partial\mu$ then setting $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} := \mathbf{f}(\mu) \implies \int_{\mathcal{C}} R_{\mathbf{f}} \equiv \int_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}} \Omega_n = \int_{\mathbf{f}(\mu)} \Omega_n = \int_{\mu} \Omega_{\mathbf{f}}$, as

⁴here $D(a, b, c) = (d[c] - b + a)$, and in the denominator $D(a, c) = (-\partial a, 0, d[c] + a)$. One really needs currents with log poles here (and a reduction-to-NCD argument); e.g. see [KLM, Sect. 5.9].

$[\zeta]_{i-1}^* := (\rho_S)_* \circ (\rho_X)^* : [F^{i-1}]H^{i-1}((\mathbb{C}^*)^n) \rightarrow H^{i-1}(\eta_S)$ is zero; hence $[\zeta]_{i-1*} := (\rho_X \circ (\rho_S)^{-1})_* : H_{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_{i-1}((\mathbb{C}^*)^n, \mathbb{Q})$ is zero also: given $\mathcal{C} \in Z_{i-1}^{\text{top}}(S \setminus D)$, there exists $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \in C_i^{\text{top}}((\mathbb{C}^*)^n)$ bounding on $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{C})$. A straightforward argument then shows $\int_{\mathcal{C}} R_{\mathbf{f}_\sigma} = \int_{\Theta(\pi_\sigma(\rho^{-1}(\mathcal{C})))} \Omega_i \equiv \int_{\pi_\sigma(\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}})} \Omega_i = \int_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}} \wedge^\sigma \text{dlog} \mathbf{z} \pmod{\mathbb{Q}(i)}$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})(\mathcal{C}) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n} \int_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}} \wedge^\sigma \text{dlog} \mathbf{z} \otimes [\wedge^\sigma \text{dlog} \mathbf{z}]^\vee \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}} (\cdot) \in \frac{\{[F^i]H^i((\mathbb{C}^*)^n, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee}{\text{im} \{H_i((\mathbb{C}^*)^n, \mathbb{Q}(i))\}} \cong \oplus_\sigma \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}(i), \end{aligned}$$

and $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ may be viewed as *one* differential character taking values in a vector space modulo a $\mathbb{Q}$ -lattice. This is the point of view we will generalize to X smooth projective.

Part 3. Concrete description of the invariants

10. REDUCTION OF THE TARGET SPACES

Once more take $X/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ smooth projective ($n = \dim X$), $\mathcal{Z} \in Z^n(X_k)$ such that $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \in \mathcal{L}^i C H^n(X_k)$, and spread $\mathcal{Z}$ out to get $\zeta \in Z^n(X \times \eta_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$. We want to compute $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z}) = Gr_{\mathcal{L}^i C \mathcal{H}}^i(\zeta)$; but in general the target space $Gr_{\mathcal{L}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}}^i(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ can be complicated, and Ψ_i difficult to describe geometrically.

That is in stark contrast to the relative cases considered in Part 2, for instance $X' = (\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n$ [with dual $\hat{X}' = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$]. Since $F^{n-i+1}H^{2n-i}(X', \mathbb{C}) = 0$, rational equivalence was “controlled by” the rather simple object $\frac{[F^{n-i}]}{F^{n-i+1}}H^{2n-i}(X')$ [or dually by $[F^i]H^i(\hat{X}')$].

One naturally wonders whether neglecting $F^{n-i+1}H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})[\neq 0]$ in $Gr_{\mathcal{L}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}}^i$ markedly simplifies its presentation. The answer is yes, and the resulting invariants $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ (quotients of $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$) turn out to be differential characters. These are computed by membrane integrals on X (different from Griffiths’s prescription; see Remark 4.1). The caveat is that they only capture rational inequivalences “regulated” by *holomorphic* forms on X .

The following notation is good for the rest of the paper. Set

$$\tilde{\Lambda} := H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}), \quad \tilde{V} := \tilde{\Lambda} \otimes \mathbb{C} = H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}),$$

and note that $\tilde{V} = F^{n-i}\tilde{V}$. Also let

$$V := \tilde{V} / F^{n-i+1}\tilde{V} = \{F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee, \quad \Lambda := \text{im} \left\{ \tilde{\Lambda} \xrightarrow{j} V \right\} \cong \tilde{\Lambda} / \ker(j),$$

and remark that $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Lambda \geq 2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V$ (usually $>$ holds). We now explain how to take the appropriate quotients of $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}g^n(X \times \eta_S)$ and $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$, then finally $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$.

Reduction of $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}g^n(X \times \eta_S)$. Set

$$H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} := H^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}), \quad \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} := W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} = \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}).$$

Referring to (4.5) and (4.1) (omitting the twist),

$$(10.1) \quad Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}g^n(X \times \eta_S) = Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)) \cong F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n} \cap \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n}.$$

It is worth noting that this maps *injectively* to

$$\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} \cong Hom_{\mathbb{Q}}(\underline{H}_i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}), H_i(X, \mathbb{Q})),$$

where one thinks of $\underline{H}_i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \cong \text{coim} \{H_i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_i(S, \mathbb{Q})\}$ as topological cycles on S , which can be moved (in their class on S) to avoid an arbitrary [not necc. irreducible] divisor $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset S$.

Now observe that $F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n} = \sum_{k=0}^i F^k \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^{n-k} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$; writing $F_X^{n-i+1} H_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n} := \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$, $W_{\mathbb{C}} := (F_X^{n-i+1} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}) \cap (F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n})$, we have

$$\frac{F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}}{W_{\mathbb{C}}} = F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \frac{[F^{n-i}]}{F^{n-i+1}} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) =: F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V).$$

(Note that $F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \cong F^i H^i(S, \mathbb{C})$.) The reduction is then achieved via the composition

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \ker \{ F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n} \oplus \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} \rightarrow \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n} \} & \xlongequal{\hspace{1cm}} & : F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n} \cap \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} \\ \downarrow (*) & & \downarrow \phi_i \\ \ker \left\{ \frac{F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}}{W_{\mathbb{C}}} \oplus \frac{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n}}{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} \cap W_{\mathbb{C}}} \rightarrow \frac{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}}{W_{\mathbb{C}}} \right\} & & \\ \downarrow \cap & & \\ \ker \left\{ \frac{F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}}{W_{\mathbb{C}}} \oplus \frac{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n}}{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} \cap F_X^{n-i+1} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}} \rightarrow \frac{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}}{F_X^{n-i+1} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n}} \right\} & & \\ \downarrow \cong & & \\ \ker \{ F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V) \oplus \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda) \rightarrow \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V) \} & \xlongequal{\hspace{1cm}} & : F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V) \cap \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda), \end{array}$$

which may also be expressed as a map⁵

$$' \phi_i : Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H} g^n(X \times \eta_S) \rightarrow Hom_{\mathbb{C}} \{F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C}), F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C})\} \cap Hom_{\mathbb{Q}} \{\underline{H}_i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}), \overline{H}_i(X, \mathbb{Q})\}.$$

This time injectivity of the map (from the r.h.s.) to the $Hom_{\mathbb{C}}$ piece is what shall be useful.

Remark 10.1. (i) Write $F_h^1 \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q})$ for the largest sub-Hodge-structure of $\underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \cap F^1 \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C})$; this is zero if [Grothendieck's] GHC holds. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \ker(*) &\subseteq \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} F^k \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^{n-k} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) \right\} \cap \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n} \\ &\subseteq F_h^1 \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}), \end{aligned}$$

we expect $(*)$ is an isomorphism; but we won't assume this.

(ii) By contrast (provided $V \neq 0$), $\{F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes V\} \cap \{\underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \Lambda\}$ is *not* contained in $\{F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \cap \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q})\} \otimes \Lambda$ (which is zero), essentially because $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Lambda > \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V$ (and so similar reasoning does not apply). So the target of $' \phi_i$ is certainly nonzero.

Reduction of $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$. Now let

$$H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} := H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}), \quad \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} := W_{2n-1} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}.$$

From (4.5), (4.2) (omitting the twist), and the description of the Ext^1/Hom quotient (in §4),

$$\begin{aligned} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S) &= \frac{Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), W_{-1}(H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)))}{\text{im} \{Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), Gr_0^W(H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)))\}} \\ &= \frac{Ext_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n))}{\text{im} \{Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(0), (Gr_{2n}^W H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n))\}} \\ (10.2) \quad &\cong \frac{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}}{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} + F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} + \{W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} + F^n W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}\} \cap \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}} \end{aligned}$$

(since $W_{2n} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} = \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}$).

Next one notices that

$$F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} F^k \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^{n-k} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$$

⁵here $\overline{H}_i(X, \mathbb{Q}) := \text{Poincaré duals of } \Lambda$. To get a (sort of) feeling for what this looks like: in a situation where the *unamended* GHC (in general false, see [L1]) holds, this is $\lim_{\rightarrow Y \subseteq X(\text{codim. } 1)} \text{coker} \{H_i(Y, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_i(X, \mathbb{Q})\} = \text{coim} \{H_i(X, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_i(X_{\text{rel}}, \mathbb{Q})\}.$

$$\subseteq \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) =: F_X^{n-i+1} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} F^n W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} &= \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} F^k W_i H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} F^{n-k} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) \\ &\subseteq W_i H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) \\ &= W_i H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\{W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} + F^n W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}\} \cap \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} \subseteq \\ &W_i H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \{H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}) + F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})\} \\ &\quad \cap W_{i-1} H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) \\ &= W_{i-1} H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \{H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}) + F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})\} \\ &\subseteq \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} + F_X^{n-i+1} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We write our conclusion as a projection

$$\begin{aligned} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S) &\xrightarrow{\phi_{i-1}} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S) / F_X^{n-i+1} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} = \frac{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}}{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} + F_X^{n-i+1} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}} \\ &= \frac{\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})}{\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}) + \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})} \\ &\cong Hom\left(\underline{H}_{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}), \frac{H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})}{H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}) + F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})}\right) \\ &= Hom(\underline{H}_{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}), \{F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C})\}^{\vee} / \text{im}\{H_i(X, \mathbb{Q})\}) \\ &=: \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, V/\Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Reduction of $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$. Define a complex of sheaves in the analytic topology (on $S_{\mathbb{C}}$)

$$\Lambda\{i\}_{\mathcal{D}} := \Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_S \otimes V \rightarrow \Omega_S^1 \otimes V \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Omega_S^{i-1} \otimes V \rightarrow 0$$

(where Λ = constant sheaf placed in degree 0), and set

$$H_{\mathcal{D}}^*(S, \Lambda\{i\}) := \mathbb{H}^*(S, \Lambda\{i\}_{\mathcal{D}}).$$

One may define similar groups for η_S via a Deligne-Beilinson approach (as in [EV]); and we write

$$\underline{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\}) := \text{im}\{H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(S, \Lambda\{i\}) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\})\}.$$

By a standard argument one has a diagram (with exact rows)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & H^{i-1}(S, V/\Lambda) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(S, \Lambda\{i\}) & \longrightarrow & \ker \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} F^i H^i(S, V) \\ \oplus H^i(S, \Lambda) \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow H^i(S, V) \right\} \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\
0 & \longrightarrow & H^{i-1}(\eta_S, V/\Lambda) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\}) & \longrightarrow & \ker \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} F^i H^i(\eta_S, V) \\ \oplus H^i(\eta_S, \Lambda) \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow H^i(\eta_S, V) \right\} \longrightarrow 0 .
\end{array}$$

Here V is treated simply as an abelian group (and ignored by the Hodge filtration). Since $\ker\{H^i(S, \Lambda) \rightarrow H^i(S, V)\}$ and $\ker\{F^i H^i(S, V) \rightarrow F^i H^i(\eta_S, V)\}$ are both zero, α is injective. It follows immediately that the top row of the following (where we have not yet defined ϕ_i) is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
(10.3) & 0 \rightarrow \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, V/\Lambda) & \xrightarrow{q} & \underline{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\}) & \xrightarrow{p} & F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V) \cap \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda) \rightarrow 0 \\
& \quad \quad \quad \uparrow \phi_{i-1} & & \quad \quad \quad \uparrow \phi_i & & \quad \quad \quad \uparrow \phi_i \\
0 \rightarrow Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S) & \xrightarrow{q} & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) & \xrightarrow{p} & Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}g^n(X \times \eta_S) \rightarrow 0 .
\end{array}$$

One notices a formal similarity between the top row, and the situation $[X = (\mathbb{P}^1, \{0, \infty\})^n, V = \oplus_{\sigma} \mathbb{C}, \Lambda = \oplus_{\sigma} (2\pi i)^i \mathbb{Q}]$ in Part 2; but the restriction on the weights (e.g., $\underline{H}^{i-1} = W_{i-1} H^{i-1}$) constitutes a substantial difference.

The bottom row of (10.3) admits a Deligne-homology-type presentation, namely

$$\begin{array}{c}
(10.4) \\
\frac{\ker \left\{ \frac{Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\tilde{\Lambda}))}{d\Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\tilde{\Lambda}))} \oplus \frac{Z(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(\tilde{V}))}{d\Gamma(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(\tilde{V}))} \rightarrow \frac{Z({}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(\tilde{V}))}{d\Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(\tilde{V}))} \right\}}{N^1(\text{num})} \\
\quad \quad \quad \uparrow p \\
\frac{\ker \left\{ Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\tilde{\Lambda})) \oplus Z(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(\tilde{V})) \oplus \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(\tilde{V})) \xrightarrow{D} Z({}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(\tilde{V})) \right\}}{\tilde{N}^1(\text{num}) + \text{im} \left\{ \Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\tilde{\Lambda})) \oplus \Gamma(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(\tilde{V})) \oplus \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-2}(\tilde{V})) \rightarrow \text{num} \right\}} \\
\quad \quad \quad \uparrow q \\
\frac{Z({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(\tilde{V}))}{d\Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-2}(\tilde{V})) + \left\{ N^1\Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(\tilde{V})) + W_i^S \Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}(\tilde{\Lambda})) + W_i^S \Gamma(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(\tilde{V})) \right\} \cap \text{num}}
\end{array}$$

(see notation⁶ below). We explain how to derive the middle term below.

On the other hand, a (less horrible) differential-character-type presentation of (10.3)'s top row will serve to motivate and guide the discussions in §11 and §14:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (10.5) \quad & \ker \left\{ \frac{Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda))}{d\Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\Lambda)) + N^1(\text{num})} \oplus Z(F_S^i {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(V)) \rightarrow \frac{Z({}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(V))}{d\Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V)) + N^1 Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda))} \right\} \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \uparrow p \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \ker \left\{ \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V)) \xrightarrow{d} \frac{Z({}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(V))}{Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda)) + Z(F_S^i {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(V))} \right\} \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \frac{d\Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-2}(V)) + N^1 \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V)) \cap \text{num} + \Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\Lambda))}{\uparrow q} \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \frac{Z({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V))}{d\Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-2}(V)) + N^1 Z({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V)) + Z(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\Lambda))}
 \end{aligned}$$

where p is obtained by taking d . To obtain ϕ_i in (10.3), simply send $(\overline{\mathcal{C}}, \Omega, \overline{R})$ in the middle term of (10.4), to $(\overline{R})$ in the middle term above.

We sketch an argument for the middle terms of (10.4) and (10.5) above; the outer terms (and proving exactness) are more straightforward and left to the reader. First recall that $H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ may be computed as the $2n^{\text{th}}$ cohomology of the [Deligne homology(= $\mathcal{D}H$)] complex

$$C_{\mathcal{D}}^{\bullet}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) := \left\{ \Gamma(C_{2(n+t)-\bullet}^{X \times S} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)) \oplus \Gamma(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{\bullet}) \oplus \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{\bullet-1}) \right\}$$

⁶**Notation:** here $'\mathcal{D}_S^*(\tilde{V})$ denotes $\tilde{V}$ -valued currents (and so forth), $Z(\dots)$ is closed sections, and “num” means numerator. When working with $\tilde{V}$ -valued currents, the Hodge filtration is conscious of $\tilde{V}$, e.g. $F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(\tilde{V}) = \sum_k (F_{(S)}^k {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i) \otimes (F_{(X)}^{n-k} \tilde{V})$; whereas in (10.5) V is treated (as above) as a $\mathbb{C}$ -vector-space, $F_{[S]}^i {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(V) = (F^i {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i) \otimes V$.

The N^1 's work as follows: let K_S, M_S be groups of global sections of currents or chains on S (including direct sums and kernels). Then $N^1(K_S)$ denotes sections supported on any codimension 1 $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq S$, so that in particular $N^1\{\ker(K_S \rightarrow M_S)\} = \ker\{N^1(K_S) \rightarrow M_S\}$. In contrast, define $\tilde{N}^1\{\ker(K_S \rightarrow M_S)\} := \varinjlim_{D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \text{im} \left(\ker\{K_{\tilde{D}} \rightarrow M_{\tilde{D}}\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} K_S \right)$, where $K_{\tilde{D}}$ and $M_{\tilde{D}}$ are corresponding objects on a normalization of D . (Strictly speaking, since an arbitrary D has non-normal crossings, we must actually take $\tilde{D}$ to be the normalization of the *preimage* of D under an embedded resolution $b: \hat{S} \rightarrow S$ as in the proof of Prop. 3.2; $\mathcal{N}$ is then the composition $\tilde{D} \rightarrow \hat{S} \rightarrow S$, which still has image in codimension 1.)

Finally, $W_i^S \Gamma(\dots)$ means sections closed on η_S (i.e., mod N^1) such that the image in $H^*(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{Q})$ lies in W_i .

of abelian groups, with differential $D(a, b, c) = (-\partial a, -d[b], d[c] - b + \delta_a)$ and where C (resp. $'\mathcal{D}$) denotes C^∞ chains (resp. currents). Multiplying a, b, c by $\frac{1}{(2\pi\sqrt{-1})^n}$, we may omit the $\mathbb{Q}(n)$ twist in the first $\oplus$ -factor (for computational purposes).

Denote by $C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^\bullet$ the subcomplex consisting of products of chains (resp. currents) on S and X (for example, $\Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{\bullet-1})$ is replaced by $\sum_{j+k=\bullet-1} \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_S^j) \otimes \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_X^k)$). The inclusion $C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^\bullet \hookrightarrow C_{\mathcal{D}}^\bullet$ is a quasi-isomorphism, and $C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^\bullet$ admits an obvious filtration $\mathcal{L}_S^\bullet$ on each term, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_S^i C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^{2n} = & \left\{ \left(\sum_{j \geq i} \Gamma(C_{2t-j}^S) \otimes \Gamma(C_j^X) \right) \oplus \left(\sum_{j \geq i} \sum_{\ell} \Gamma(F^\ell ' \mathcal{D}_S^j) \otimes \Gamma(F^{n-\ell} ' \mathcal{D}_X^{2n-j}) \right) \right. \\ & \left. \oplus \left(\sum_{j \geq i} \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_S^{j-1}) \otimes \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_X^{2n-j}) \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If we set

$$(10.6) \quad \mathcal{L}_S^i H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) := \frac{\{\ker(D) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_S^i C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^{2n}\}}{\text{im}\{\mathcal{L}_S^{i-1} C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^{2n-1} \rightarrow C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^{2n}\} \cap \mathcal{L}_S^i C_{\mathcal{D}, \times}^{2n}},$$

then $\Phi(\mathcal{L}_S^i H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}) = \mathcal{L}_S^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$. (One has “=” and not just “ $\subseteq$ ”, because the maps of graded pieces are surjective.) In words, the Leray filtration is represented by $\mathcal{DH}$ -triples of the form $(\mathcal{L}^i, \mathcal{L}^i, \mathcal{L}^{i-1})$ in degree $2n$ modulo coboundaries coming from $(\mathcal{L}^{i-1}, \mathcal{L}^{i-1}, \mathcal{L}^{i-2})$ in degree $2n-1$. Straightforward (but tedious) arguments with $\mathcal{DH}$ -triples then show that the middle term of (10.4) *without* the $\tilde{N}^1$, is equal to $Gr_{\mathcal{L}_S}^i H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$.

Now arguing for the normal-crossings case (replacing η_S by $S \setminus D$, $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ a NCD), one has an exact sequence (e.g., see [mS])

$$H_{\mathcal{D}, X \times D}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow{\alpha} H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times (S \setminus D), \mathbb{Q}(n)) \rightarrow 0$$

(where $\underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $\text{im}\{H_{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{H}}\}$). It follows from work of Deligne⁷ that $H^{2n-2}(X \times \tilde{D}) \rightarrow W_{2n} H_{X \times D}^{2n}(X \times S)$, hence that one may replace α above by $H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n-2}(X \times \tilde{D}, \mathbb{Q}(n-1)) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\alpha}} H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$. Since $\tilde{\alpha}$ and Φ are strictly compatible with

⁷Use the exact sequence $W_i H^{i-1}(S \setminus D) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}} W_i H_D^i(S) \rightarrow H^i(S) \rightarrow W_i H^i(S \setminus D)$ together with Deligne’s description (in [De1, sec. 3.2]) of $W_i H^{i-1}(S \setminus D)$ and the fact ([De2, Cor. 8.2.8]) that $\text{im}\{H_D^i(S) \rightarrow H^i(S)\} = \text{im}\{H^{i-2}(\tilde{D}) \rightarrow H^i(S)\}$, to get $H^{i-2}(\tilde{D}) \twoheadrightarrow W_i H_D^i(S)$.

Leray,⁸ one concludes that $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i\{\underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}\} \cong \text{coker}\{Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i(\tilde{\alpha})\}$. To transfer this result to the non-NCD case, assume $D(= \text{NCD})$ is the preimage of $D_0(= \text{non-NCD})$ under an embedded resolution $b : S \rightarrow S_0$, so that $(S \setminus D) = (S_0 \setminus D_0)$. The surjective map $H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \xrightarrow{b_*^{\mathcal{D}}} H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S_0, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ is then (since $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i b_*^{\mathcal{D}}$ are surjective) strictly compatible with Leray and factors Φ ; hence $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times (S_0 \setminus D_0), \mathbb{Q}(n)) \cong \frac{Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S_0, \mathbb{Q}(n))}{(b_*^{\mathcal{D}} \circ \tilde{\alpha})\{Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n-2}(X \times \tilde{D}, \mathbb{Q}(n-1))\}}$. Combining this with (10.6) and taking a limit gives the middle term of (10.4).

Moving on to (10.5), it will suffice to show that its middle term without the $N^1\Gamma(\cdots) \cap \text{num}$ in the denominator, is isomorphic to $H_{\mathcal{D}}^i(S, \Lambda\{i\})$. The latter has a standard Deligne-homology presentation as the i^{th} cohomology of $C_{\mathcal{D}}^{\bullet}(S, \Lambda\{i\}) = \Gamma(C_{2t-\bullet}^S(\Lambda)) \oplus \Gamma(F_S^i {}'\mathcal{D}_S^{\bullet}(V)) \oplus \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{\bullet-1}(V))$. Moreover, $\ker\{D : C_{\mathcal{D}}^i \rightarrow C_{\mathcal{D}}^{i+1}\} \subseteq$

$$(10.7) \quad Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda)) \oplus Z(F_S^i {}'\mathcal{D}^i(V)) \oplus \ker \left\{ \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V)) \rightarrow \frac{Z({}'\mathcal{D}^i(V))}{Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda)) + Z(F_S^i {}'\mathcal{D}_S^i(V))} \right\}$$

since (for $(a, b, c) \in C_{\mathcal{D}}^i$) $0 = D(a, b, c) \implies \partial a, db = 0$ while $dc = b - a$. If we project $\ker\{D : C_{\mathcal{D}}^i \rightarrow C_{\mathcal{D}}^{i+1}\}$ to the third $\oplus$ -factor of (10.7), then $\text{im}\{D : C_{\mathcal{D}}^{i-1} \rightarrow C_{\mathcal{D}}^i\}$ is sent to the subgroup $d\Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-2}(V)) + \Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(V))$; explicitly for $(A, B, C) \in C_{\mathcal{D}}^{i-1}$ one has $F_{(S)}^i {}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1} = 0 \implies B = 0$, and $D(A, 0, C) = (-\partial A, 0, dC + A)$ is sent to $dC + A$. Hence we get the desired isomorphism.

11. REDUCED HIGHER AJ-MAPS

Let $\mathcal{L}^i Z^n(X_k)$ denote cycles with class in $\mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k)$; we now define maps

$$\chi_i : \mathcal{L}^i Z^n(X_k) \rightarrow \underline{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\}).$$

Considering the middle term of (10.5) $[\cong \underline{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\})]$ and the discussion in §9, one might expect $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ to be presented as a V/Λ -valued differential $(i-1)$ -character. (Recall this is a functional on topological $(i-1)$ -cycles with a special property on bounding cycles.) Accordingly, here is the initial *ad hoc* construction of χ_i :

Take $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^i Z^n(X_k)$ with any (fixed) choice of complete spread $\bar{\zeta}$, and let $D \subset S$ (defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, codim. 1) be such that the restriction of $\bar{\zeta}$ to $X \times (S \setminus D)$ has relative dimension 0 (over $S \setminus D$). Now pick any $\mathcal{C} \in Z_{i-1}^{\text{top}}(S \setminus D)$. Since $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^i$, $[\zeta]_{i-1} = 0 \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\underline{H}_{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}), H_{i-1}(X, \mathbb{Q}))$. Therefore $\rho_X(\rho_S^{-1}(\mathcal{C}))$

⁸i.e., for the obvious $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{D}}^{\bullet}$ on $H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n-2}(X \times \tilde{D}, \mathbb{Q}(n-1))$ one can show $\tilde{\alpha}(\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{D}}^{i-2}) = \mathcal{L}_S^i \cap \text{im}(\tilde{\alpha})$ (e.g., by arguing explicitly with $\mathcal{DH}$ -triples). We have already noted this property for Φ .

has trivial class in $H_{i-1}(X, \mathbb{Q})$, and so may be written $\partial\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ (for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} \in C_i^{top}(X)$ defined up to an i -cycle). If $\{\omega_\ell\} \subseteq \Omega^i(X)$ is a basis for $F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C})$ then the membrane integrals

$$(11.1) \quad \chi_i(\mathcal{Z})\mathcal{C} := \left\{ \int_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}} \omega_\ell \right\}$$

give a “value” in V/Λ . If $\mathcal{C} \stackrel{\text{hom}}{\equiv} 0$ on S , then there exists $\mathcal{K} \in C_i^{top}(S)$ such that $\mathcal{C} = \partial\mathcal{K}$ and $X \times \mathcal{K}$ intersects $\bar{\zeta}$ properly (i.e. in the right real codimension). Again modulo i -cycles on X , $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = \rho_X(\rho_S^{-1}(\mathcal{K}))$ and so

$$(11.2) \quad \chi_i(\mathcal{Z})\partial\mathcal{K} \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{\equiv} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{K}} \rho_S * \rho_X^* \omega_\ell \right\}$$

amounts to integrals of holomorphic i -forms (or one V -valued holomorphic i -form) over $\mathcal{K}$. So (11.1) defines a differential character.

To produce a class in $\underline{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\})$ from this, we need a corresponding V -valued $(i-1)$ -current R , with $\int_{\mathcal{C}} R \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{\equiv} \chi_i(\mathcal{Z})\mathcal{C}$; that is, one current for each ω_ℓ . There are in fact many possible choices of R , but (as we will show) their differences lie in the denominator of the middle term of (10.5). We sketch one explicit construction (of an R) here, and another (for X a product of curves) in §14 which resembles the regulator currents of §§8–9 more closely.

Let $\{\gamma^k\}, \{\gamma_k^*\}$ be dual bases for $H_{2t-i}(S, \mathbb{Q})$ and $H_i(S, \mathbb{Q})$ (resp.) and $\{\sigma^m\}$ be a basis for $H_{2t-i+1}(S, \mathbb{Q}) [\cong H_{i-1}(S, \mathbb{Q})^\vee]$. (The γ ’s and σ ’s are all topological cycles.) For some $\alpha_\ell^k \in \mathbb{C}$, $[\sum \alpha_\ell^k \gamma^k] = [\rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_\ell] \in H^i(S, \mathbb{C})$; and so there exist $R_\ell^0 \in \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_S^{i-1})$ with $d[R_\ell^0] = \rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_\ell - \sum_k \alpha_\ell^k \delta_{\gamma^k}$. Collecting these together, and writing $[\omega_\ell]^\vee \in V$ for the functional evaluating (for each m) to $\delta_{\ell m}$ on $[\omega_m]$, $R^0 := \{R_\ell^0\} = \sum_\ell R_\ell^0 \otimes [\omega_\ell]^\vee \in \Gamma(' \mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V))$ has

$$\begin{aligned} d[R^0] &= \{\rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_\ell\} - \left\{ \sum_k \alpha_\ell^k \delta_{\gamma^k} \right\} \\ &= \sum_\ell (\rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_\ell) \otimes [\omega_\ell]^\vee - \sum_k \gamma_k \otimes \left(\sum_\ell \alpha_\ell^k [\omega_\ell]^\vee \right) =: \Omega^0 - \mathbb{C}^0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha_\ell^k = \int_{\gamma_k^*} \rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_\ell = \int_{\rho_X(\rho_S^{-1}(\gamma_k^*))} \omega_\ell$,

$$\sum_\ell \alpha_\ell^k [\omega_\ell]^\vee = \int_{\rho_X(\rho_S^{-1}(\gamma_k^*))} (\cdot) \in \text{im}\{H_i(X, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C})^\vee\} = \Lambda.$$

Therefore $C^0 \in Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda))$, and R^0 has the property $\int_{C=\partial\mathcal{K}} R^0 \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{=} \int_{\mathcal{K}} \Omega^0$. However, if $\mathcal{C}$ is *not* a boundary the value $\int_{\mathcal{C}} R^0$ needs correcting (in order to be $\equiv \chi_i(\mathcal{Z})\mathcal{C}$); an *ad hoc* modification $R = R^0 + \{\sum_m \beta_\ell^m \delta_{\sigma^m}\}$ ($\beta_\ell^m \in \mathbb{C}$) of the current R^0 does the trick (for all $\mathcal{C}$). Clearly $d[R] = \Omega^0 - C^0 \in Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda)) + Z(F_S^i \mathcal{D}_S^i(V))$, so R gives a class in the middle term of (10.5).

To check well-definedness, let R' be another $(i-1)$ -current in $\ker \left\{ \Gamma(\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V)) \rightarrow \frac{Z(\mathcal{D}_S^i(V))}{Z(C_{2t-i}^S(\Lambda) + Z(F_S^i \mathcal{D}_S^i(V)))} \right\}$, writing $dR' = \Omega'_0 - C'_0$; and assume that $\int_{\mathcal{C}} R' \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{=} \int_{\mathcal{C}} R$ (*a fortiori* $\int_{\partial\mathcal{K}} R' \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{=} \int_{\mathcal{K}} \Omega_0$) for all $\mathcal{C} \in Z_{i-1}^{\text{top}}(S \setminus D)$ (resp. admissible $\mathcal{K} \in C_i^{\text{top}}(S)$). By a $\bar{\partial}$ -regularity lemma from Hodge theory, a d -closed current of pure type $(i, 0)$ is in fact a holomorphic form; hence $\Omega_0, \Omega'_0 \in \Omega^i(S) \otimes V$. But $0 \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{=} \int_{\partial\mathcal{K}} (R - R') = \int_{\mathcal{K}} d[R - R'] = \int_{\mathcal{K}} \{(\Omega_0 - \Omega'_0) - (C_0 - C'_0)\}$ is then incompatible with the fact that continuous deformations of $\mathcal{K}$ should continuously change the value of $\int_{\mathcal{K}} (\Omega_0 - \Omega'_0)$, unless $\Omega_0 - \Omega'_0 = 0$. Hence $C_0 - C'_0 = d[R - R']$, and must be d of some $C_1 \in \Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\Lambda))$. This makes $R - R' - C_1$ d -closed on S *a fortiori* on $S \setminus D$, where $\int_{\mathcal{C}} R - R' - C_1 \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{=} \int_{\mathcal{C}} R - R' \stackrel{\text{mod } \Lambda}{=} 0$ shows its class is “ Λ -integral”, thus shared with some $C_2 \in \Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\Lambda))$ (with ∂C_2 supported on D). We have therefore that $\{R - R' - (C_1 + C_2)\} \in \{d\Gamma(\mathcal{D}_S^{i-2}(V)) + N^1\Gamma(\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V))\}$, and so $R - R' \in$ denominator of (10.5)’s middle term.

We emphasize an important point: that $\underline{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\})$ can be put into 1 – 1 correspondence with [the limit over D of] a certain class of $(V/\Lambda$ -valued) functionals⁹ on topological $(i-1)$ -chains on $S \setminus D$.

Now that we have a well-defined class $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z}) = R \in \underline{H}_{\mathcal{D}}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda\{i\})$, set

$$\overline{[\zeta]}_i := p(\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})).$$

This is essentially $d[R]$ (in the last term of (10.5)), whose image under $\ker \{ \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda) \oplus F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V) \rightarrow \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V) \} \hookrightarrow F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V)$ is just Ω^0 , i.e.

$$\sum_{\ell} [\omega_{\ell}]^{\vee} \otimes [\rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_{\ell}] \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C}), F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C})).$$

If $\overline{[\zeta]}_i$ vanishes then $(\forall \ell) [\rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_{\ell}] = 0 \in F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \implies$ the forms $\rho_{S*} \rho_X^* \omega_{\ell}$ are identically zero. For $\mathcal{C} = \partial\mathcal{K}$, (11.2) now becomes $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})\partial\mathcal{K} \equiv 0 \pmod{\Lambda}$ and $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ gives a V/Λ -valued functional on *homology classes*, i.e. an element of $\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, V/\Lambda)$. On the level of the exact sequence (10.5), $\Omega^0 =$

⁹namely, those that evaluate $\pmod{\Lambda}$ on all $\partial\mathcal{K}$ to $\int_{\mathcal{K}} \Omega$ for some fixed $\Omega \in \Omega^i(S) \otimes V$. These are different from those encountered in §9 since here (a) $\mathcal{K}$ need not avoid D and (b) Ω cannot have poles along D .

$0 \implies -d[R] = C^0 \implies [C^0] = 0 \in \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda) \implies C^0$ has a primitive $K^0 \in \Gamma(C_{2t-i+1}^S(\Lambda))$. We may modify $R \mapsto R + K^0 =: \tilde{R}$ (for free) to get $\tilde{R} \in Z(\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V))$; this slides back along q to give a class in $\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, V/\Lambda)$. Of course, $\tilde{R}$ and R do not yield distinct differential characters; $\tilde{R}$ is just the right choice of current.

So if $\overline{[\zeta]}_i = 0$, define $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_{i-1}$ by

$$q[\overline{AJ\zeta}]_{i-1} = \chi_i(\mathcal{Z});$$

and use either approach above to compute it.

Remark 11.1. In some situations it may be easier to show $\overline{[\zeta]}_i = 0$ than $[\zeta]_i = 0$ (equivalent only if GHC holds). However, for $i > t = \dim S$ one already knows $[\zeta]_i = 0$ — a Lefschetz argument as in §3 shows $\underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) = 0$.

We now say how all this relates to the invariants of Part 1: the present invariants are “quotients” of them. For instance, in case $[\bar{\zeta}] = 0$ (so that $[AJ(\zeta)]_{i-1}$ is computed by $\int_{\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta}}(\cdot)$ for $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^i CH_0$, one can easily check the following (see [Ke4, sec. 4.3]): write $\underline{H}^*(S_{rel}) := \text{coim}\{H^*(S_{rel}) \rightarrow H^*(S)\} \cong \varprojlim_D \text{im}\{H^*(S, D) \rightarrow H^*(S)\}$; then restricting functionals via $\{F^{t+1}(H^{2t-i+1}(S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^i(X, \mathbb{C}))\}^\vee \rightarrow \{\underline{H}^{2t-i+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee$ induces a (well-defined) map $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\underline{H}_{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}), \frac{\Omega^i(X)^\vee}{\text{im}\{H_i(X, \mathbb{Q})\}})$ sending $[AJ(\zeta)]_{i-1} \mapsto \overline{[AJ(\zeta)]_{i-1}}$. However, we need a stronger result for §§13–14, where $\bar{\zeta} \stackrel{\text{hom}}{=} 0$ cannot necessarily be arranged. Most importantly, we want χ_i to be well-defined on $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i CH^n(X_k)$ (i.e., modulo $\stackrel{\text{rat}}{=}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{i+1}$); and proving this requires precisely the characterization (10.6). Here, then, is what one can say:

Proposition 11.2. *On $\mathcal{L}^i Z^n(X_k)$, $\phi_i \circ \Psi_i = \chi_i$.*

Corollary 11.3. *(i) χ_i kills $\mathcal{L}^{i+1} Z^n$ and cycles $\stackrel{\text{rat}}{=} 0$, i.e. is defined on $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i CH^n(X_k)$.*

(ii) $\overline{[\zeta]}_i = \phi_i([\zeta]_i)$, and if $[\zeta]_i$ (not $\overline{[\zeta]}_i$) vanishes (so that $[AJ\zeta]_{i-1}$ is defined), then $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_{i-1} = \phi_{i-1}([AJ\zeta]_{i-1})$.

(iii) If either $\overline{[\zeta]}_i$ or $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_{i-1}$ is nonzero, then $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \notin \mathcal{L}^{i+1} CH^n(X_k)$. In particular, $\mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\neq} 0$.

Proof. (of Proposition) Given $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^i Z^n(X_k)$, let $\bar{\zeta}$ be any choice of complete spread; this has Deligne class $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\bar{\zeta}) = (\bar{\zeta}, \delta_{\bar{\zeta}}, 0)$ in

$$(11.3) \quad H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \cong \frac{\ker \left\{ Z(C_{2t}^{X \times S} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)) \oplus Z(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{2n}) \oplus \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{2n-1}) \xrightarrow{D} Z({}'\mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{2n}) \right\}}{\operatorname{im} \left\{ \Gamma(C_{2t+1}^{X \times S} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(n)) \oplus \Gamma(F^n {}'\mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{2n-1}) \oplus \Gamma({}'\mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{2n-2}) \xrightarrow{D} \text{num} \right\}},$$

where $D(A, B, C) = (-\partial A, -d[B], d[C] - B + \delta_A)$ [δ_A = delta-function current via integration along A]. This $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta)$ maps to $c_{\mathcal{H}}(\zeta) \in \mathcal{L}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n))$ under Φ . Since $\Phi(\mathcal{L}_S^i H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}) = \mathcal{L}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}$ and $\ker(\Phi) = \varinjlim_D \{ \operatorname{im} H_{\mathcal{D}, X \times D}^{2n}(X \times S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) \}$ [limit over divisors $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq S$], we can modify $c_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta)$ by a D-closed triple (N_{top}, N_F, N_K) supported on some $X \times D$, to get a class in $\mathcal{L}_S^i H_{\mathcal{D}}^{2n}$ (with the same Φ -image). This means that we can add a D-coboundary (triple) to the modified class, to get a triple (C, Ω, R) in the numerator of (10.6) (i.e. $C, \Omega \in \mathcal{L}_S^i$, $R \in \mathcal{L}_S^{i-1}$, and all three Künneth-decomposed). Explicitly,

$$(11.4) \quad \begin{aligned} D(\Xi_{top}, \Xi_F, \mathcal{K}) + (\bar{\zeta}, \delta_{\bar{\zeta}}, 0) + (N_{top}, N_F, N_K) = \\ \sum_{j \geq i} \left(\sum_k \mathcal{C}_{2t-j}^{S,k} \times \mathcal{C}_j^{X,k}, \sum_{\ell} \Omega_{S,\ell}^j \wedge \Omega_{X,\ell}^{2n-j}, \sum_m R_{S,m}^{j-1} \wedge R_{X,m}^{2n-j} \right) \\ =: (C, \Omega, R). \end{aligned}$$

(where k, ℓ, m are dummy indices and the others indicate degree). We may assume that the $\mathcal{C}_*^{S,k}, \mathcal{C}_*^{X,k}$ resp. $\Omega_{S,\ell}^*, \Omega_{X,\ell}^*$ are ∂ - resp. d -closed, and consequently that the $R_{X,m}^{2n-i}$'s (but not all $R_{X,m}^*$'s) are also d -closed. Hence, writing $[\cdot]$ for (co)homology class on X ,

$$\left(\sum_k \mathcal{C}_{2t-i}^{S,k} \otimes [\mathcal{C}_i^{X,k}], \sum_{\ell} \Omega_{S,\ell}^i \otimes [\Omega_{X,\ell}^{2n-i}], \sum_m R_{S,m}^{i-1} \otimes [R_{X,m}^{2n-i}] \right)$$

gives a class in the middle term of (10.4), and this is $\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z})$.

Next, ϕ_i sends this to the class of $\sum_m R_{S,m}^{i-1} \otimes \overline{[R_{X,m}^{2n-i}]} \in \Gamma(S, {}'\mathcal{D}_S^{i-1}(V))$ in the middle term of (10.5). (Here the bar indicates the quotient $H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) = \tilde{V} \twoheadrightarrow V = \{F^i H^i(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee$.) We must check that this $\phi_i(\Psi_i(\mathcal{Z}))$ gives the same V/Λ -valued differential character as $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})$ by integrating it over topological $(i-1)$ -cycles $\mathcal{C} \in Z_{i-1}^{top}(S \setminus D)$. Let $\{\omega_\ell\} \subseteq \Omega^i(X)$ be a basis. Since $\left(\sum_{j \geq i+1} \sum_m R_{S,m}^{j-1} \wedge R_{X,m}^{2n-j} \right) \wedge \pi_X^* \omega_\ell$ integrates to 0 on $\mathcal{C} \times X$ (by degree), this amounts to checking that the vectors $\left\{ \int_{\mathcal{C} \times X} R \wedge \pi_X^* \omega_\ell \right\}$ and $\chi_i(\mathcal{Z})\mathcal{C}$ are (for each such $\mathcal{C}$) equal in V/Λ . It is thus more than sufficient to show for *any* $\omega \in \Omega^i(X)$ and $\mathcal{C} \in Z_{i-1}^{top}(S \setminus D)$, that $\int_{\mathcal{C} \times X} R \wedge \pi_X^* \omega = \int_{\Gamma} \omega$ where $\partial \Gamma = \rho_X(\rho_S^{-1}(\mathcal{C}))$.

From (11.4), $R = d\mathcal{K} - \Xi_F + \delta_{\Xi_{top}} + N_{\mathcal{K}}$. Since $\Xi_F \in \Gamma(F^n \mathcal{D}_{X \times S}^{2n-1})$ and $\pi_X^* \omega \in \Gamma(F^i \Omega_{X \times S}^i)$, $\Xi_F \wedge \pi_X^* \omega$ has less than $n-1$ $d\bar{z}$'s and so π_{S*} (which involves fiberwise integration along X) kills it. Hence, $\int_{\mathcal{C} \times X} \Xi_F \wedge \pi_X^* \omega = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \pi_{S*} \{\Xi_F \wedge \pi_X^* \omega\} = 0$. Next, $\mathcal{C} \times X$ does not intersect the support (in $D \times X$) of $N_{\mathcal{K}}$, so $\int_{\mathcal{C} \times X} N_{\mathcal{K}} \wedge \pi_X^* \omega = 0$; and $\int_{\mathcal{C} \times X} d\mathcal{K} \wedge \pi_X^* \omega = \int_{\mathcal{C} \times X} d\{\mathcal{K} \wedge \pi_X^* \omega\} = 0$ since ω is closed. We have therefore

$$\int_{\mathcal{C} \times X} R \wedge \pi_X^* \omega = \int_{(\mathcal{C} \times X) \cap \Xi_{top}} \pi_X^* \omega = \int_{\pi_X\{(\mathcal{C} \times X) \cap \Xi_{top}\}} \omega.$$

Now from (11.4) again, $\partial \Xi_{top} = \bar{\zeta} + N_{top} - \sum_{j \geq i} \sum_k \mathcal{C}_{2t-j}^{S,k} \times \mathcal{C}_j^{X,k}$; clearly $N_{top} \cap (\mathcal{C} \times X) = 0$ and the same may be assumed for $\sum_{j \geq i} (\cdots) \cap (\mathcal{C} \times X)$ also (by degree on S). Hence, $\partial \pi_X\{(\mathcal{C} \times X) \cap \Xi_{top}\} = \pi_X\{(\mathcal{C} \times X) \cap \partial \Xi_{top}\} = \pi_X\{(\mathcal{C} \times X) \cap \bar{\zeta}\} = \rho_X(\rho_S^{-1}(\mathcal{C}))$. $\square$

Remark 11.4. The reader familiar with the work of S. Saito (e.g., [sS]) may expect that the $[\bar{\zeta}]_i$ identify with so-called ‘‘Mumford invariants’’ (specialized to the case where X is defined $/\mathbb{Q}$). A version of these comes from filtering the image of the dlog cycle-class map $CH^n(X_k) \rightarrow H^n(X_k, \Omega_{X_k/\mathbb{Q}}^n)[\otimes \mathbb{C}]$. (Note that [EP] defined similar invariants. Strictly speaking, Saito’s target is $\mathbb{H}^n(X, \Omega_{X_k/\mathbb{Q}}^{\geq n})$.) Writing $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \Omega_{X_k/\mathbb{Q}}^n := \Omega_{k/\mathbb{Q}}^i \otimes \Omega_{X_k/k}^{n-i}$, one defines a spectral sequence $E_1^{i,j} = H^{i+j}(X_k, Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \Omega_{X_k/\mathbb{Q}}^n) \implies H^{i+j}(X_k, \Omega_{X_k/\mathbb{Q}}^n)$. Since d_1 is just the (graded) arithmetic Gauss-Manin connection $\bar{\nabla}$, $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i H^n(X_k, \Omega_{X_k/\mathbb{Q}}^n) = E_{\infty}^{i,n-i} = E_2^{i,n-i}$ is the middle cohomology of the complex

$$\rightarrow \Omega_{k/\mathbb{Q}}^{i-1} \otimes H^{n-1}(\Omega_{X_k/k}^{n-i+1}) \xrightarrow{\bar{\nabla}} \Omega_{k/\mathbb{Q}}^i \otimes H^n(\Omega_{X_k/k}^{n-i}) \xrightarrow{\bar{\nabla}} \Omega_{k/\mathbb{Q}}^{i+1} \otimes H^{n+1}(\Omega_{X_k/k}^{n-i-1}) \rightarrow .$$

For us $X_k = X_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \otimes k$, so $\bar{\nabla} = 0$ and that cohomology is simply $\Omega_{k/\mathbb{Q}}^i \otimes H^n(\Omega_{X_k/k}^{n-i})$; tensored with $\mathbb{C}$, this becomes $\Omega_{k/\mathbb{Q}}^i \otimes Gr_F^{n-i} H^{2n-i}(X_{\mathbb{C}}^{(an)}, \mathbb{C})$ by GAGA. For $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k)$, the resulting invariant is just the image of $[\bar{\zeta}]_i$ under the composition

$$F^i \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, V) \cap \underline{H}^i(\eta_S, \Lambda) \hookrightarrow F^i H^i(S^{(an)}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes V \cong H^0(\Omega_{S/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^i) \otimes V \hookrightarrow \Omega_{k/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}^i \otimes V,$$

where the last map is given by evaluation at the ‘‘very general’’ point $s_0 \in S_{(\mathbb{C})}$.

12. FINER INVARIANTS: $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr}$ AND CONIVEAU

Recall from §4 that when $[\bar{\zeta}]$ vanishes, $[AJ\zeta]_{i-1}$ (for any i) is computed by Griffiths’ prescription $\int_{\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta}}(\cdot)$, restricted to give a functional on $F^{t+1}\{\underline{H}^{2t-i+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^i(X, \mathbb{C})\} \subseteq F^{t+1}\{H^{2t-i+1}(S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^i(X, \mathbb{C})\}$. (This

function identifies with an element of $\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} / F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}$ in the notation of (10.2)). In an ideal world (where the Hodge conjecture is a theorem), this completely describes $[AJ\zeta]_{n-1}$ in particular (or $[AJ\zeta]_t$ if $t < n-1$), since $[\zeta]_0$ thru $[\zeta]_n$ must be zero ($\implies [\zeta] = 0 \xrightarrow{\text{HC}} [\bar{\zeta}] = 0$) for it to be defined. What we lack, is a precise description of $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$, and towards some $[AJ\zeta]_1$ computations in §§15 – 17 we now remedy this for $i = 2$.

Specializing the notation of §10 to $i = 2$, $H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} = H^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and $\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} = W_{2n-1} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}$; also note that $W_{2n} H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} = H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}$. According to (10.2),

$$Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S) = \frac{\text{Ext}_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}, \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}(n))}{\text{im} \left\{ \text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}, \frac{H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}}{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}}(n)) \right\}} = \frac{\text{Ext}_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}, \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1}(n))}{\{H_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} \cap F^n H_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}\} \cap \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}}.$$

It is the denominator that we want to better compute, namely the image of

$$(12.1) \quad \text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(-n), Gr_2^W H^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q})).$$

Since $Gr_2^W H^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q})$ is of pure type $(1, 1)$, recalling $Hg^{n-1}(X) = H^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \cap F^{n-1} H^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{C}) = \text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(-n+1), H^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q}))$ we have that (12.1) $\cong$

$$(12.2) \quad \text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(-n), Gr_2^W H^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes Hg^{n-1}(X)).$$

Using now purity of $Hg^{n-1}(X)$, we easily see that the image of (12.2) [hence (12.1)] in $\text{Ext}_{\text{MHS}}^1$ is the same as the image of

$$(12.3) \quad (\{F^1[W_2]H^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) + [W_2]H^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q})\} \cap \underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{C})) \otimes Hg^{n-1}(X).$$

Since $\dim(X) = n$, the (dualized) Lefschetz $(1, 1)$ theorem allows us to replace $Hg^{n-1}(X)$ by $H_{\text{alg}}^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q})$; similarly $Hg^1(X) = H_{\text{alg}}^2(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and we write $H_{\text{tr}}^2(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and $H_{\text{tr}}^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ (resp.) for their orthogonal complements under the cup product. Of course $\cup$ makes H_{alg}^2 and H_{alg}^{2n-2} , hence H_{tr}^2 and H_{tr}^{2n-2} , duals.

Now in $\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} / F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1} \cong$

$$\{F^t \underline{H}^{2t-1}(S_{\text{rel}}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^1 H^2(X, \mathbb{C}) + [F^{t-1}] \underline{H}^{2t-1}(S_{\text{rel}}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^2 H^2(X, \mathbb{C})\}^{\vee},$$

the image of (12.3) may be seen as functionals arising from integrals over

$$\{(2t-1)\text{-chains bounding on divisors defined } / \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset S\} \times \{\text{curves on } X\}.$$

However for our purposes it will be acceptable to quotient out by $\underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H_{alg}^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{C})$ (which contains (12.3)). Writing $\underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}, tr}^{2n-1} = \underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H_{tr}^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and so on, set

$$(12.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S))_{tr} &:= \frac{Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)}{\underline{H}^1(\eta_S) \otimes H_{alg}^{2n-2}(X)} \cong \frac{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}, tr}^{2n-1}}{\underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}, tr}^{2n-1} + F^n \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}, tr}^{2n-1}} \\ &\cong \frac{\{F^t \underline{H}^{2t-1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^1 H_{tr}^2(X, \mathbb{C}) + \underline{H}^{2t-1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^2 H^2(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee}{\text{im} \{ \underline{H}_{2t-1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H_2^{tr}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \}} \end{aligned}$$

where $H_2^{tr}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ is Poincaré duals of $H_{tr}^{2n-2}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ and $\underline{H}_*(S_{rel}, \mathbb{Q}) := \text{im} \{ H_*(S) \rightarrow H_*(S_{rel}) \}$. This is a much less drastic quotient than

$$\underline{H}^1(\eta_S, V/\Lambda) \cong \{ \underline{H}^{2t-1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^2 H^2(X, \mathbb{C}) \}^\vee / \text{im} \{ \underline{H}_{2t-1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H_2^{tr}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \}.$$

We write $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr}$ for the (projected) image of $[AJ(\zeta)]_1$ in (12.4).

In the event that $\boxed{t (= \dim S) = 1}$, $\underline{H}^1(S_{rel}) = \text{coim} \{ H^1(S_{rel}) \rightarrow H^1(S) \} \cong H^1(S)$ and (12.4) simplifies to

$$(12.5) \quad \begin{aligned} (Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^1 \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S))_{tr} &= \frac{\{F^1 H^1(S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^1 H_{tr}^2(X, \mathbb{C}) + H^1(S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^2 H^2(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee}{\text{im} \{ H_1(S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H_2^{tr}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \}} \\ &= \frac{\{H^{1,0}(S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H_{tr}^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus H^1(S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^{2,0}(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee}{\text{periods}}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr} \in (12.5)$ is the image of $[AJ(\zeta)]_1$ (which in this case $= \Psi_2(\mathcal{Z})$ since $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^2 \underline{H} g^n(X \times \eta_S) = \{0\}$ for $t = 1$). Note that the $\mathbb{Q}$ -dimension of the period lattice equals the $\mathbb{R}$ -dimension of the numerator.

We summarize the picture for $i > 2$. Write $F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ for the largest sub-Hodge-structure of $H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})$ contained in $H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \cap F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$, and $F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$ for its complexification. The analogue of (12.1) is then

$$(12.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &Hom_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(-n), Gr_i^W H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})) \cong \\ &Hom_{\text{MHS}}([Gr_{2t-i}^W H^{2t-i+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{Q})] \otimes \mathbb{Q}(t-n), H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})). \end{aligned}$$

Since $F^i H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) = \{0\}$, dually $H^{2t-i+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C}) = F^{t-i+1} H^{2t-i+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{C})$; hence picking any $\theta \in (12.6)$, $\text{im}(\theta) \subseteq F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})$. It follows that (12.6) $\cong$

$$Hom_{\text{MHS}}([Gr_{2t-i}^W H^{2t-i+1}(S_{rel}, \mathbb{Q})] \otimes \mathbb{Q}(t-n), F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})) \cong$$

$$(12.7) \quad \text{Hom}_{\text{MHS}}(\mathbb{Q}(-n), Gr_i^W H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})),$$

the analogue of (12.2). Writing $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Q}} := W_i H^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})$, the image of (12.7) [hence (12.6)] in $\text{Ext}_{\text{MHS}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(-n), \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}))$ is then given by

$$\{F^n \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}} + \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}\} \cap \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q})$$

(compare to (12.3)), and so $\text{im}\{Hom\}$ will be absorbed if we quotient $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$ by $\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F_h^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$. It is a very important point, that this is usually (substantially) smaller than the $\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes F^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$ by which we quotiented in §10 (to get $\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, V/\Lambda)$). In fact, provided GHC holds, it is precisely $\underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes N^{n-i+1} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$; while [hard Lefschetz $\implies$] $H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C}) = N^{n-i} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$.

Writing $Gr_{N_X}^{n-i} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} := \underline{H}^{i-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes \frac{N^{n-i}}{N^{n-i+1}} H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{C})$, $\text{GHC} \implies \exists$ of a quotient

$$(12.8) \quad (Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S))_N := \frac{Gr_{N_X}^{n-i} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{C}}^{2n-1}}{Gr_{N_X}^{n-i} \underline{H}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2n-1} + F^n(\text{num})}$$

of $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^{i-1} \underline{J}^n(X \times \eta_S)$. This is one way to understand the notion that $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i CH^n(X_k)$ should be “controlled” by $Gr_N^{n-i} H^{2n-i}(X)$.

Part 4. Applications to products of curves

13. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

We now specialize to $X = C_1 \times \cdots \times C_n$, where C_j are smooth projective curves (of positive genus) defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, with fixed base points $o \in C_j(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$.

Two observations are in order.

The first is that the product structure is reflected in the Leray filtration on $CH^n(X_k)$. As in §7 one uses the $\frac{n!}{i!(n-i)!}$ projections (one for each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n$)

$$\pi_{\sigma} : X \longrightarrow C_{\sigma(1)} \times \cdots \times C_{\sigma(i)} =: X^{\sigma}$$

to products of i curves, to induce isomorphisms

$$H^i(X, \mathbb{Q}) \xleftarrow[\cong]{\oplus_{\sigma} (\pi_{\sigma})^*} \oplus_{\sigma} H^i(X^{\sigma}, \mathbb{Q})$$

$$H^{2n-i}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow[\cong]{\oplus_{\sigma}(\pi_{\sigma})_*} \oplus_{\sigma} H^i(X^{\sigma}, \mathbb{Q})$$

and (using functoriality and the formulas for the $Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^* \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^*$) a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k) & \xrightarrow{\oplus(\pi_{\sigma})_*} & \oplus_{\sigma} \mathcal{L}^i CH^i(X_k^{\sigma_i}) \\ \downarrow \Psi_i(n) & & \downarrow \oplus \Psi_i(i) \\ Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2n}(X \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(n)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \oplus_{\sigma} Gr_{\mathcal{L}}^i \underline{H}_{\mathcal{H}}^{2i}(X^{\sigma} \times \eta_S, \mathbb{Q}(i)). \end{array}$$

Setting (for $0 \leq i \leq n$)

$$F_{\times}^{i+1} CH^n(X_k) := \ker \{ \oplus_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_i^n} (\pi_{\sigma})_* \} \subseteq CH^n(X_k)$$

(so $F_{\times}^{n+1} CH^n = \{0\}$), one has from this diagram

$$F_{\times}^i CH^n(X_k) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^i CH^n(X_k)$$

and equality if BBC^q holds (or without BBC^q for $i \leq 2$), since the $\Psi_i(i)$ are injective in that case. Here the $\mathcal{L}^i$ are defined, as usual, via kernels of successive Ψ_i .

In particular, we shall concentrate on

$$F_{\times}^n CH^n(X_k) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{0-cycles whose projections to} \\ \text{products of } n-1 \text{ curves, are } \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv} 0 \end{array} \right\} \Big/ \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv},$$

which obviously contains all “ n -box” cycles

$$\mathcal{Z} = B(p_1, \dots, p_n) := ((p_1) - (o)) \times \dots \times ((p_n) - (o))$$

where $p_j \in C_j(k)$. We note that χ_n is (well-)defined on $F_{\times}^n CH^n(X_k)$ since it is already defined on $\mathcal{L}^n$ by Corollary 11.3 (more generally, χ_i is defined on $F_{\times}^i$).

Remark. The above n -box cycles $/k$ do not necessarily generate $F_{\times}^n CH^n(X_k)$; the latter also contains certain sums of n -box cycles *with* $p_j \in C_j(L)$, L/k algebraic, which are essentially “norms” (relative to k) of n -box cycles in $F_{\times}^n CH^n(X_L)$. (We could ignore this possibility in Part 2 because of the existence of a norm $K_n^M(L) \rightarrow K_n^M(k)$: such cycles could be replaced by ones with coordinates $\in k$.) If k was algebraically closed then of course this problem would disappear, but we have restricted in this paper to $k/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ finitely generated (in order to have S available; one may then deal with $\bar{k}$ via a limit).

The second observation is this: when $\mathcal{Z}/\{k \cong \mathbb{Q}(S)\}$ is an n -box we can explicitly compute $\chi_n(\mathcal{Z})$ as a V/Λ -valued $(n-1)$ -current “ R ” on S . This seems particularly intriguing when the spread ζ_0 of the leading corner $(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ of $\mathcal{Z}$, projects to a nontrivial correspondence $\pi_X(\zeta_0) \subseteq C_1 \times \dots \times C_n$.

The idea is to extend the homotopy technique described in §8 for $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$, to $C_1 \times \dots \times C_n$ by using the fact that each C_j can be cut into a fundamental domain $\mathbb{D}_j$. One then lifts the “ n -box graph” $\zeta = B(\zeta_0)$ to $(\mathbb{D}_1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{D}_n) \times S$ and “successively” contracts $\mathbb{D}_j$ -factors (to o , in a sense that will be clear to readers of [Ke1]). The lift traces out a $(2t+1)$ -chain $\Gamma_\zeta \subseteq S \times X$ bounding on ζ and $\{\text{topological } (2t-n)\text{-cycles on } S\} \times \{\text{topological } n\text{-cycles on } X\}$. The function of this chain is essentially to standardize the membranes Γ_ζ used (see (11.1)) in constructing the differential character χ_n , or alternatively the choice of current $R \in \Gamma(\mathcal{D}_S^{n-1}(V))$ representing it. (We are certainly *not* claiming that the topological $(2t-n)$ -cycles lie in any divisor $D \subseteq S$.)

Specifically, the currents we write down in §14 (without further proof) will correspond essentially to $\Gamma_\zeta := \pi_X\{(X \times \mathcal{C}) \cap \Gamma_\zeta\}$. They will give classes in the middle term of (10.5), which is to say $d[R]$ will be (i) a Λ -valued $(2t-n)$ -cycle plus (ii) a V -valued holomorphic current [or form]. Either (i) or (ii) can be considered to represent $\overline{[\zeta]}_n$, but we shall write $\overline{[\zeta]}_n$ for (ii), and moreover $\chi_n(\mathcal{Z})$ in lieu of R . So

$$d[\chi_n(\mathcal{Z})] = \overline{[\zeta]}_n + T_\zeta$$

now expresses the fact that $\chi_n(\mathcal{Z})$ is a differential character.

When $\overline{[\zeta]}_n = 0$ we instead write $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_{n-1}$ for R , so that

$$d\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_{n-1} = T_\zeta.$$

It is unnecessary to correct R ’s discrepancy from closedness here, since integrating it over topological cycles ($\otimes \mathbb{Q}$) already gives a cohomology class:

$$\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_{n-1} \in \text{Hom}\left(\underline{H}_{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}), \frac{\{F^n H^n(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee}{\text{im}\{H_n(X, \mathbb{Q})\}}\right) \cong \underline{H}^{n-1}(\eta_S, V/\Lambda).$$

Recall that $\underline{H}_{n-1}(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q})$ means cycles which may be moved to avoid any $D/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. We just note that if S is a curve, then $\underline{H}_1(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_1(S, \mathbb{Q})$, while if S is a surface then $\underline{H}_2(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_2^{tr}(S, \mathbb{Q})$.

Before embarking on computations, we indicate how to see Mumford’s theorem easily using $\overline{[\zeta]}_n$, provided one believes Proposition (3.2). We only do $X = C_1 \times C_2$ (i.e., $n = 2$), and leave the generalization to the reader. To prove no π_N surjects, it is enough to show

$$\mathcal{B}_N : S^{(N)}(C_1 \times C_2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}^2 CH^2(X_{\mathbb{C}})$$

$$\text{Sym}_N((p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_N, q_N)) \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^N B(p_j, q_j)$$

is surjective for no N .¹⁰

We do this by producing (for any N) a cycle in $\text{im}(\mathcal{B}_{N+1}) \setminus \text{im}(\mathcal{B}_N)$. Take $p_1, \dots, p_{N+1} \in C_1$ and $q_1, \dots, q_{N+1} \in C_2$ to be “algebraically independent” general points, in the sense that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}((C_1 \times C_2)^{\times(N+1)}) \cong \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(p_1, q_1, \dots, p_{N+1}, q_{N+1}) =: k$ (so $\text{trdeg}(k/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = 2N + 2$); set $\mathcal{Z}_{N+1} := \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} B(p_j, q_j)$.

Recall that $V = H^0(\Omega_X^2)^\vee$. Write $\{\omega_\ell\} \in H^0(\Omega_X^2)$ for a basis, and $\pi_j : S = (C_1 \times C_2)^{\times(N+1)} \rightarrow C_1 \times C_2$ for projection to the j^{th} factor. Clearly one may take $\bar{\zeta}_{N+1} := \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} (id_X \times \pi_j)^* \Delta_X \in Z^2((C_1 \times C_2)^{\times(N+2)})$; and so

$$\overline{[\zeta_{N+1}]_2} = \sum_{j=1}^{N+1} \left(\sum_{\ell} [\omega_\ell]^\vee \otimes \pi_j^* \omega_\ell \right) = \sum_{\ell} [\omega_\ell]^\vee \otimes \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N+1} \pi_j^* \omega_\ell \right)$$

gives a *nondegenerate*, anti-symmetric bilinear form $\theta_{S, s_0}^1 \times \theta_{S, s_0}^1 \rightarrow V$ (where θ_{S, s_0}^1 denotes the holomorphic tangent space). More precisely, writing $J =$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ its matrix is proportional (by a vector } \in V) \text{ to } \begin{pmatrix} J & 0 \\ & \ddots \\ 0 & J \end{pmatrix},$$

which has nonzero determinant.

Now any $\mathcal{Z}_N \in \text{im}(\mathcal{B}_N)$ is defined over a field k_0 with $\text{trdeg}(k_0/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \leq 2N$. Set $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_{N+1} - \mathcal{Z}_N$; we must show that $\overline{[\zeta]_2} \neq 0$.

Consider the simplest case $k_0 \subset k$, so that $S \xrightarrow{\pi_0} S_0$ and $\overline{[\zeta]_2} = \overline{[\zeta_{N+1}]_2} - \pi_0^* \overline{[\zeta_N]_2}$. Since $\dim(S_0) < 2N + 2$, it is impossible for π_0^* of a holomorphic 2-form S_0 to be nondegenerate on S , and so $\overline{[\zeta_{N+1}]_2} \neq \pi_0^* \overline{[\zeta_N]_2}$ as desired.

More generally ζ lives on $X \times \eta_{S'}$, where $S \xleftarrow{\pi} S' \xrightarrow{\pi_0} S_0$ (with $\dim S' =: T$), and $\zeta = \pi^* \zeta_{N+1} - \pi_0^* \zeta_N$. One easily shows the existence of a subspace of θ_{S', s'_0}^1 of dimension at least $T - N$, on which $\pi_0^* \overline{[\zeta_N]_2}$ restricts to the zero form. The maximum dimension of such a subspace for $\pi^* \overline{[\zeta_{N+1}]_2}$ is $T - N - 1$. So $\overline{[\zeta]_2} = \pi^* \overline{[\zeta_{N+1}]_2} - \pi_0^* \overline{[\zeta_N]_2} \neq 0$ and Mumford is proved.

Remark. It would *not* have done, to merely exhibit infinitely many linearly independent $\overline{[\zeta]_2}$ -classes. this only establishes that $\mathcal{L}^2 CH^2(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ contains an ∞ -dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector-space, which is not at all Mumford’s theorem (see the warning in Remark 8.2(ii)). So this is why we needed the Prop. (3.2).

¹⁰or equivalently: for no N is $\text{im}(\mathcal{B}_N)$ closed under addition. The smallest subgroup of $\mathcal{L}^2 CH^2(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ containing $\text{im}(\mathcal{B}_N)$ (for any $N \geq 1$), after all, is all of $\mathcal{L}^2 CH^2(X_{\mathbb{C}})$.

14. FORMULAS FOR THE REDUCED INVARIANTS

We now produce the currents representing $\chi_n(\mathcal{Z})$, beginning with $n = 3$ (from which the general case will be clear). We then turn to $n = 2$ and perform a computation.

Let p, q, r be points in the respective $C_i(k)$ [$i = 1, 2, 3$], and consider the “3-box” cycle $\mathcal{Z} = B(p, q, r) =$

$$(p, q, r) - (o, q, r) - (p, o, r) - (p, q, o) + (o, o, r) + (o, q, o) + (p, o, o) - (o, o, o)$$

in $Z^3((C_1 \times C_2 \times C_3)_k)$ with class $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \in \mathcal{L}^3 CH^3((C_1 \times C_2 \times C_3)_k)$. As usual we write $\zeta \in Z^3((X \times \eta_S)_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}})$ for its $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -spread, where $X = C_1 \times C_2 \times C_3$ and $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S) \cong k$.

Let $\alpha_i^{j=1, \dots, 2g_i}$ (with g_i the genus) be topological cycles on C_i spanning $H_1(C_i, \mathbb{Q})$ and all based at o . We take $\hat{\alpha}_i^j$ to be a dual basis of “markings” avoiding o , and based at another point which the α_i^j avoid. Things are set up as usual so that $[\hat{\alpha}_i^j] = [\alpha_i^{j \pm g_i}]$ (but $\hat{\alpha}_i^j \neq \alpha_i^{j \pm g_i}$), and $\alpha_i^{j_1} \cap \hat{\alpha}_i^{j_2}$ is empty unless $j_1 = j_2$ (and then it is a point). The interior of our fundamental domain (with “center” at o) is then given by $C_i \setminus \cup_j \hat{\alpha}_i^j$, and we denote its closure by $\mathbb{D}_i$.

The forms $\{\omega_i^{k=1, \dots, g_i}\} \in \Omega^1(C_i)$ integrate to give functions z_i^k on $\mathbb{D}_i$ which are zero at o . They may be viewed as discontinuous, complex-valued functions on C_i with cuts at the markings, i.e. as 0-currents like $\log z$ on $\mathbb{C}^*$, so that

$$d[z_i^k] = \omega_i^k - \sum_{j=1}^{2g_i} \omega_i^k(\alpha_i^j) \cdot \delta_{\hat{\alpha}_i^j}$$

where $\omega(\alpha) := \int_{\alpha} \omega$. Now the spreads of the points p, q, r give maps $s_i : S \rightarrow C_i$, and by composition with the z_i^k , zero-currents $f_i^k := z_i^k \circ s_i \in {}'\mathcal{D}^0(S)$, or functions on S with branch cuts $T_i^j = s_i^{-1}(\hat{\alpha}_i^j)$. We have

$$d[f_i^k] = df_i^k - \sum_{j=1}^{2g_i} \omega_i^k(\alpha_i^j) \cdot \delta_{T_i^j}$$

where $df_i^k := s_i^* \omega_i^k$. (This is of course the analogue of the formula $d[\log f] = d \log f - 2\pi i \cdot \delta_{T_f}$.)

Recalling $V := (F^3 H^3(X, \mathbb{C}))^\vee \cong (\Omega^1(C_1) \otimes \Omega^1(C_2) \otimes \Omega^1(C_3))^\vee$ and $\Lambda = \text{im}\{H_3(X, \mathbb{Q})\} \subset V$, the $V[\Lambda]$ -valued 2-current representing $\chi_3(\mathcal{Z})$ is

$$(14.1) \quad \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3} [\omega_1^{k_1} \wedge \omega_2^{k_2} \wedge \omega_3^{k_3}]^\vee \otimes \left(f_1^{k_1} df_2^{k_2} \wedge df_3^{k_3} + \sum_{j_1=1}^{2g_1} (\omega_1^{k_1}(\alpha_1^{j_1})) f_2^{k_2} df_3^{k_3} \cdot \delta_{T_1^{j_1}} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j_1, j_2} (\omega_1^{k_1}(\alpha_1^{j_1})) (\omega_2^{k_2}(\alpha_2^{j_2})) f_3^{k_3} \cdot \delta_{T_1^{j_1} \cap T_2^{j_2}} \right).$$

(An analogy to the Milnor regulator current $\log f_1 d\log f_2 \wedge d\log f_3 + 2\pi i \log f_2 d\log f_3 \cdot \delta_{T_{f_1}} - 4\pi^2 \log f_3 \cdot \delta_{T_{f_1} \cap T_{f_2}}$, where $f_j \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(S)$ are viewed as functions from $\eta_S \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$, is implied here.) Notice that d of this current is the Λ -valued 3-chain

$$\begin{aligned} T_\zeta &:= \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3} [\omega_1^{k_1} \wedge \omega_2^{k_2} \wedge \omega_3^{k_3}]^\vee \otimes \left(\sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3} (\omega_1^{k_1}(\alpha_1^{j_1}))(\omega_2^{k_2}(\alpha_2^{j_2}))(\omega_3^{k_3}(\alpha_3^{j_3})) \cdot \delta_{T_1^{j_1} \cap T_2^{j_2} \cap T_3^{j_3}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3} \left(\int_{\alpha_1^{j_1} \times \alpha_2^{j_2} \times \alpha_3^{j_3}} (\cdot) \right) \cdot \delta_{T_1^{j_1} \cap T_2^{j_2} \cap T_3^{j_3}} \end{aligned}$$

plus the holomorphic (V -valued) 3-form

$$\overline{[\zeta]}_3 = \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3} [\omega_1^{k_1} \wedge \omega_2^{k_2} \wedge \omega_3^{k_3}]^\vee \otimes df_1^{k_1} \wedge df_2^{k_2} \wedge df_3^{k_3}.$$

If the latter is zero then the current (14.1) gives (by operating on topological 2-cycles) a well-defined class $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_2 \in \underline{H}^2(\eta_S, V/\Lambda)$.

Similarly, for $\mathcal{Z} = B(p, q) \in Z^2((C_1 \times C_2)_k)$ one has for $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_1$

$$(14.2) \quad \sum_{k_1, k_2} [\omega_1^{k_1} \wedge \omega_2^{k_2}]^\vee \otimes \left(f_1^{k_1} df_2^{k_2} + \sum_{j_1=1}^{2g_1} (\omega_1^{k_1}(\alpha_1^{j_1})) f_2^{k_2} \cdot \delta_{T_1^{j_1}} \right) \in \underline{H}^1(\eta_S, \{F^2 H^2(C_1 \times C_2, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee / \Lambda)$$

provided the $df_1^{k_1} \wedge df_2^{k_2}$ vanish, as for instance is the case when $\dim S = \text{trdeg}(k/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = 1$. We now give an example of such a case, where $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_1 \neq 0$ (and thus $\mathcal{Z} \not\equiv_{\text{rat}} 0$).

We mentioned in §10 that $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \Lambda$ might be larger than $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} V [= g_1 g_2]$; one situation where this does *not* happen is for $C_1 = C_2 = E$ an elliptic curve (defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$) with *complex multiplication*. To be concrete, let $E = \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{F}) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be defined by the equation

$$\mathbf{F}(x, y, z) = y^2 z - x^3 + 5xz^2 = 0,$$

with $\omega = \text{Res}_E \left(\frac{z dx \wedge dy - y dx \wedge dz + x dy \wedge dz}{\mathbf{F}(x, y, z)} \right) \in \Omega^1(E)$ (in affine coordinates $\omega = dx/y$). For the 0-currents resulting from the integrals $\int_o^* \omega$ on $\mathbb{D}$ we will write simply z_1, z_2 ; these are just the standard “plane coordinates” on the factors $E \times E$. We choose the topological 1-cycles α, β in such a way that $\Omega_1 = \Omega = \int_\alpha \omega$ and $\Omega_2 = i\Omega = \int_\beta \omega$, where $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}$ is some transcendental number. We then have $\int_{\alpha \times \beta} dz_1 \wedge dz_2 = (i\Omega)\Omega = i\Omega^2$, $\int_{\beta \times \beta} dz_1 \wedge dz_2 = (i\Omega)(i\Omega) = -\Omega^2$,

$\int_{\alpha \times \alpha} dz_1 \wedge dz_2 = \Omega^2$, which give the period lattice $\mathbb{Q} \langle \Omega^2, i\Omega^2 \rangle = \Lambda \subset V = \{F^2 H^2(E \times E)\}^\vee = \langle dz_1 \wedge dz_2 \rangle^\vee = \mathbb{C}$.

Now take a base point o defined over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ (say, the point at ∞), and a general point p defined over $k \cong \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(E)$ (so that S and E will be birationally equivalent). There also exists a “nontorsion” point $\xi \in E(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, which means that $\int_o^\xi \omega$ is nonzero in $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q} \langle \Omega, i\Omega \rangle$. (In fact, for this particular curve one can take $o, \xi \in E(\mathbb{Q})$.) We study the cycle

$$\mathcal{Z} = B(p, p - \xi) = (p, p - \xi) - (o, p - \xi) - (p, o) + (o, o),$$

with class $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \in \mathcal{L}^2 CH^2((E \times E)_k)$ and spread $\bar{\zeta} \subseteq E \times E \times E$, and $\overline{[\zeta]}_2 = 0$ (since $\dim S = 1$).

The spreads of p and $p - \xi$ give rise to maps $(s_1, s_2) = (id, id - \xi) : S \simeq E \rightarrow E \times E$. We choose our cuts $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}$ so that $z = \int_o \omega [= z(o)]$ takes values in the square $-\Omega/2 \leq \Im(z) \leq \Omega/2$, $-\Omega/2 \leq \Re(z) \leq \Omega/2$ centered at 0, and pick α, β to have support along the real and imaginary axes, respectively. Composing $(id, id - \xi)$ with z gives zero-currents f and g on $S \simeq E$, with cuts T_f^α, T_f^β (and T_g^α, T_g^β). Using df, dg (both $= dz$) for the pullbacks of ω (by s_1, s_2), we can now write down the basic 1-current (from (14.2))

$$\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_1 = [f dg + \Omega g \cdot \delta_{T_f^\alpha} + i\Omega g \cdot \delta_{T_f^\beta}] \in \text{hom}(\underline{H}_1(\eta_E), \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q} \langle \Omega^2, i\Omega^2 \rangle).$$

Now in fact, since $f = z \circ id$, $T_f^\alpha = \hat{\alpha}$ and $T_f^\beta = \hat{\beta}$. So integrating the current term by term over $\alpha \in H_1(E) \cong \underline{H}_1(\eta_E)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\alpha f dg &= \int_\alpha z dz = \int_{-\Omega/2}^{\Omega/2} z dz = 0, \\ \sum_{p \in T_f^\alpha \cap \alpha} \Omega \cdot g(p) &= \sum_{p \in \hat{\alpha} \cap \alpha} \Omega \cdot g(p) = \Omega \cdot g(\pm \Omega/2) = \pm \frac{\Omega^2}{2} - \xi \Omega, \\ \sum_{p \in T_f^\beta \cap \alpha} i\Omega \cdot g(p) &= 0 \text{ since } \hat{\beta} \cap \alpha = \emptyset \text{ (they are parallel).} \end{aligned}$$

The only nonzero entry is nontorsion in $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z} \langle \Omega^2, i\Omega^2 \rangle$, which is to say nonzero in V/Λ , and so $0 \neq \overline{[AJ\zeta]}_1$, which $\implies 0 \neq \langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle \in \mathcal{L}^2 CH^2((E \times E)_k)$. So we have just used basic calculus to show a cycle $\mathcal{Z} = B(p, p - \xi) \in \ker(\text{Alb})$ is not rationally equivalent to zero. For purposes of comparison (and this is easy to show explicitly), the cycle $2\mathcal{Z}_{(p,p)}$ is rationally equivalent to zero.

One can perform a similar computation for $\mathcal{Z} = B(\xi, p, q)$ or $B(p, q - p, q - \xi)$ on $X = E \times E \times E$, where q and p are algebraically independent general points on E , using (14.1). The reader who wishes to attempt this as an exercise

should note that for $S = E \times E$, $H_2(\eta_S, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H_2^{tr}(E \times E, \mathbb{Q})$ is spanned by just $\alpha \times \alpha - \beta \times \beta$ and $\alpha \times \beta + \beta \times \alpha$ (the Neron-Severi group has rank 4). Whichever of these one integrates $\overline{[AJ\zeta]}_2$ over, some care with signs is necessary.

In [Ke4, sec. 6.3] we will treat the more nontrivial example $\mathcal{Z} = B(p, q) \in Z^2((E \times E)_k)$, where (p, q) is the inclusion of a very general point on the (genus 3) Fermat quartic curve under $\mathfrak{F} \rightarrow E \times E$. This is accomplished by turning $\overline{[AJ(\zeta)]}_1$ (in the form above for general $C_1 \times C_2$) into a collection of iterated integrals.

15. A $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z})$ CALCULATION

We now give an elementary proof of the very general result of [RS] regarding 0-cycles on products of curves. This essentially contains the $E \times E$ example above, as well as Nori's examples (which exclude CM curves) — but not the Fermat example. Since the cycles considered are in the Albanese kernel, already $[AJ\zeta_0]$, $[\zeta]_0$, $[\zeta]_1$ are zero. Since they are of transcendence degree 1, $[\zeta]_2 = 0$; hence $[\zeta] = 0$ and by Lefschetz (1,1) (see §4) one may arrange $[\tilde{\zeta}] = 0$, though this will also be clear from the form of the cycle. So $[AJ(\zeta)]_1$ (or rather the slight quotient $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr}$) may be computed by Griffiths's prescription $\int_{\partial^{-1}\tilde{\zeta}}(\cdot)$ as a functional in [the numerator of] (12.5).

Let C_1 and C_2 be smooth projective curves defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, both of positive genus. Take $o \in C_1$ to be a rational base point and $p \in C_1(k)$ (where $k \cong \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(C_1)$) to be general. Choose a 0-cycle $\mathcal{W}/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\langle \mathcal{W} \rangle \in CH_{hom}^1(C_2)$ and nontorsion image $AJ(\mathcal{W}) \in J^1(C_2)$; write $\partial^{-1}\mathcal{W}$ for any choice of bounding chain (connecting the dots).

Proposition 15.1. *Set $X = C_1 \times C_2$, and consider the 0-cycle $\mathcal{Z} := ((p) - (o)) \times \mathcal{W} \in \ker(\text{Alb}) \subset Z^2(X)$. Then $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z})$ is nontrivial.*

The remainder of the present section is devoted to the proof.

Notation: If $\mathcal{H}_{(\mathbb{Q})}$ is a rational Hodge structure of weight $2m - 1$, we write $J(\mathcal{H}) := \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}}/(F^m\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}} + \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ for the (rational) Jacobian. (For a curve C , $J(C)$ is just $J(H^1(C))$.) Injective and surjective maps of HS induce (resp.) injective and surjective maps of Jacobians, and $J(\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2) = J(\mathcal{H}_1) \oplus J(\mathcal{H}_2)$. Moreover for $\mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}_0$ is naturally a HS and $J(\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}_0) \cong J(\mathcal{H})/J(\mathcal{H}_0)$.

We will work with the following (weight 3) rational HS's, all subHS's of $\mathcal{H}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_0 &= H^1(C_1) \otimes H^2(X), \quad \mathcal{F}_0 = H^1(C_1) \otimes F_h^1 H^2(X), \\ \mathcal{H}_1 &= H^1(C_1) \otimes H^1(C_1) \otimes H^1(C_2), \quad \mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}_1 = H^1(C_1) \otimes F_h^1 \{H^1(C_1) \otimes H^1(C_2)\}, \\ \mathcal{H}_{\Delta} &= \mathbb{Q}[\Delta_{C_1}]_1 \otimes H^1(C_2). \end{aligned}$$

Note in particular that $F_h^1 H^2(X) = H_{alg}^2(X)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_0/\mathcal{F}_0) = H^1(C_1) \otimes H_{tr}^2(X)$; and that $[\Delta_{C_1}]_1 \in H^1(C_1) \otimes H^1(C_1)$ is the 1st Künneth component of the fundamental class, so that $J(\mathcal{H}_\Delta) \cong \mathbb{Q}[\Delta_{C_1}]_1 \otimes J(C_2)$.

The Setup: We spread $\mathcal{Z}$ out over $S = C_1$ (recall $X = C_1 \times C_2$), with full spread

$$\bar{\zeta} := (\Delta_{C_1} - C_1 \times \{o\}) \times \mathcal{W} \in Z^2(C_1 \times (C_1 \times C_2)_{/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}).$$

This has $[\bar{\zeta}] = 0$ (because $\mathcal{W} \stackrel{\text{hom}}{=} 0$), with bounding chain $\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta} := (\Delta_{C_1} - C_1 \times \{o\}) \times \partial^{-1}\mathcal{W}$. The image of the functional

$$\left\{ \int_{\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta}} (\cdot) \right\} \in \frac{\{F^2(H^1(C_1, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^2(X, \mathbb{C}))\}^\vee}{\text{im} \{H_1(C_1, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H_2(X, \mathbb{Q})\}} \cong J(\mathcal{H}_0)$$

under the projection to (12.5) $\cong J(\mathcal{H}_0/\mathcal{F}_0)$, is obviously $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr}$ and we must show this is not zero. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} J(\mathcal{H}_0) & \xrightarrow{p_0} & J(\mathcal{H}_0/\mathcal{F}_0) & & \\ \downarrow p_1 & & \downarrow \bar{p}_1 & & \\ J(\mathcal{H}_\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & J(\mathcal{H}_1) & \xrightarrow{p_2} & J(\mathcal{H}_1/\mathcal{F}_1) = \frac{J(\mathcal{H}_1)}{J(\mathcal{F}_1)}. \end{array}$$

One easily shows¹¹ that $\iota([\Delta_{C_1}]_1 \otimes AJ_{C_2}(\mathcal{W})) = p_1 \left(\int_{\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta}} (\cdot) \right)$ in $J(\mathcal{H}_1)$. By hypothesis $AJ(\mathcal{W}) \neq 0$, so this is nonzero; we are done if we can show p_2 does not kill it, since then $\bar{p}_1([AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr}) \neq 0$. This is accomplished if $(p_2 \circ \iota)$ is injective, which would follow if $J(\mathcal{F}_1) \oplus J(\mathcal{H}_\Delta) \hookrightarrow J(\mathcal{H}_1)$.

The Hodge-theoretic input: Thus we have merely to show that

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_\Delta = \{0\}$$

in $\mathcal{H}_1$ (we actually show $\mathcal{F}_1^\mathbb{C} \cap \mathcal{H}_\Delta^\mathbb{C} = \{0\}$). Let $\{\omega_i\} \subseteq \Omega^1(C_{1/\mathbb{C}})$ be a basis satisfying $\sqrt{-1} \int_{C_1} \omega_i \wedge \bar{\omega}_j = \delta_{ij}$. An element $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_1^\mathbb{C}$ is of the form $\sum \omega_i \otimes A_i + \sum \bar{\omega}_i \otimes B_i$ where A_i, B_i belong to $\{F_h^1(H^1(C_1) \otimes H^1(C_1))\}_\mathbb{C}$ (and are hence of type $(1,1)$). Suppose $\mathbf{f}$ also belongs to $\mathcal{H}_\Delta^\mathbb{C}$; that is, $\mathbf{f} = [\Delta_{C_1}]_1 \otimes \Gamma$ for some $\Gamma \in H^1(C_2, \mathbb{C})$. Writing

$$\sum \omega_i \otimes A_i + \sum \bar{\omega}_i \otimes B_i = i \left(\sum \omega_i \otimes \bar{\omega}_i - \sum \bar{\omega}_i \otimes \omega_i \right) \otimes \Gamma,$$

¹¹Viewing $\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1$ as their own duals, p_1 is induced by restriction of functionals $(F^2\mathcal{H}_0^\mathbb{C})^\vee \rightarrow (F^2\mathcal{H}_1^\mathbb{C})^\vee$ and kills $\int_{C_1 \times \{o\} \times \partial^{-1}\mathcal{W}} (\cdot)$; hence $p_1 \left(\int_{\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta}} (\cdot) \right) = p_1 \left(\int_{\Delta_{C_1} \times \partial^{-1}\mathcal{W}} (\cdot) \right)$. Under $(H^1(C_1)^{\otimes 2})^\vee \cong H^1(C_1)^{\otimes 2}$, $\int_{\Delta_{C_1}} (\cdot)$ identifies with $[\Delta_{C_1}]_1$; while $\int_{\partial^{-1}\mathcal{W}} (\cdot) \in (F^1 H^1(C_2, \mathbb{C}))^\vee$ yields $AJ(\mathcal{W})$.

we have $A_1 = \bar{\omega}_1 \otimes \Gamma$, $B_1 = \omega_1 \otimes \Gamma$ which is impossible in terms of *type*, unless $\Gamma = 0$. Hence $f = 0$ and we are done.

16. A SURPRISE FROM TRANSCENDENTAL NUMBER THEORY

In this section we consider $\chi_2(\mathcal{Z})$ for the cycles of §15, and ask whether χ_2 misses anything that Ψ_2 picks up.

Here is another way of putting Proposition 15.1: let C_1, C_2 (both of positive genus) be defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $p \in C_1(\mathbb{C})$ very general, $o \in C_1(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ and $\mathcal{W} \in Z_0^{\text{hom}}(C_2/\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$. Set $\mathcal{Z} = (p - o) \times \mathcal{W}$. Then the following four conditions are equivalent:

- (I). $AJ(\mathcal{W})$ is nonzero in $J^1(C_2)$ (i.e., nontorsion in the integral Jacobian).
- (II). $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{\text{tr}} \neq 0$ in (12.5).
- (III). $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z}) \neq 0$.
- (IV). $\langle \mathcal{Z} \rangle$ is nonzero in $CH_0(C_1 \times C_2/\mathbb{C})$.

Proof. We have shown $(I) \implies (II) \implies (III) \implies (IV)$, and “not (I)” $\implies$ “not (IV)” is clear. $\square$

Recall that $\chi_2(\mathcal{Z})$ is a projected image of $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z})$ (and easier to compute). In the situation at hand (i.e. $\dim X = 2$, $\dim S = 1$), it is just

$$\overline{[AJ(\zeta)]_1} \in \frac{\{H^1(S, \mathbb{C}) \otimes H^{2,0}(X, \mathbb{C})\}^\vee}{\text{im } \{H_1(S, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H_2(X, \mathbb{Q})\}},$$

which can be obtained from $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{\text{tr}} \in (12.5)$ by forgetting the $H_{\text{tr}}^{1,1}(X)$ -part of the functional. But it does surprisingsly well at detecting cycles as far as we can compute:

Proposition 16.1. *With the notation above, and $C_i = E_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) **elliptic** curves $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$,*

- (V). $\chi_2(\mathcal{Z}) \neq 0$

is equivalent to the conditions (I) thru (IV), assuming a conjecture of Waldschmidt for the case where E_1 and E_2 are non-isogenous non-CM curves.

In particular, we have not been able to find a 0-cycle $\mathcal{Z}$ with $\chi_2(\mathcal{Z}) = 0$ but $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z}) \neq 0$.

The rest of the section is the proof. We will show that for $\mathcal{Z}$ of the above form, assuming $\overline{[AJ(\zeta)]_1} = 0$ and $AJ_{E_2}(\mathcal{W}) \neq 0$ leads to a contradiction. (Here as usual $AJ(\mathcal{W})$ is the image in the *rational* Jacobian.) Hence $(I) \implies (V)$ (the converse, of course, is clear).

Note first that the rational Neron-Severi group $NS(E_1 \times E_2) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ has rank 2, 3, 4 according as E_1 and E_2 are nonisogenous, isogenous without CM, isogenous with CM. In the latter (rank 4) case, $H_{tr}^{1,1}(E_1 \times E_2) = 0$ and so $[AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr}$, $\overline{[AJ(\zeta)]_1}$ are the same invariant. So in this case we have immediately $\overline{[AJ(\zeta)]_1} = 0 \implies AJ(\mathcal{W}) = 0$.

Notation: We may write the elliptic curves E_j ($j = 1, 2$) in Weierstrass form $\{y^2 = 4x^3 - (g_2)_j x - (g_3)_j\}$ with $(g_2)_j, (g_3)_j \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, ω_j = pullback to E_j of dx/y , and o = point at ∞ (and $p \in E_1(\mathbb{C})$ very general). Pick $\alpha_j, \beta_j \in Z_1^{top}(E_j)$ spanning $H_1(E_j, \mathbb{Q})$ such that $\alpha_j \cdot \beta_j = +1$, and write periods $\Omega_{j\alpha} = \int_{\alpha_j} \omega_j$, $\Omega_{j\beta} = \int_{\beta_j} \omega_j$, $\tau_j := \Omega_{j\beta}/\Omega_{j\alpha}$ (with $\Im(\tau_j) > 0$). Up to $\stackrel{\text{rat}}{\equiv}$, $\mathcal{W}$ is just $(q) - (o)$ for some $q \in E_2(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, and we write $\partial^{-1}\mathcal{W} = \overrightarrow{o, q}$ for some fixed choice of path. Integrating along it yields $\xi := \int_o^q \omega_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, which projects to $AJ_{E_2}(\mathcal{W}) \in \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Q}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle$. Finally, let A_j and B_j be Poincaré duals (C^∞ 1-forms) for α_j, β_j ; and $\wp_j$ denote the Weierstrass $\wp$ -function on $(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}\langle\Omega_{j\alpha}, \Omega_{j\beta}\rangle) \cong E_j(\mathbb{C})$.

Computations: We compute $\chi_2(\mathcal{Z})$, for $\mathcal{Z} = ((p) - (o)) \times ((q) - (o))$. If we write $\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta} = (\Delta_{E_1} - E_1 \times \{o\}) \times \overrightarrow{o, q}$, evaluating $\int_{\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta}} (\cdot) \in \{H^1(E_1) \otimes H^{2,0}(E_1 \times E_2)\}^\vee$ on the basis $\mathfrak{B} = \{A_1 \otimes \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2, B_1 \otimes \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2\}$ yields a vector

$$\vec{\nu}_{\mathcal{Z}} = (\Omega_{1\alpha}\xi, \Omega_{1\beta}\xi) \in \mathbb{C}^2.$$

(The $E_1 \times \{o\}$ term in $\partial^{-1}\bar{\zeta}$ plays no role.) The projection of $\vec{\nu}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ to $\mathbb{C}^2/\mathbb{L}$ gives $\overline{[AJ(\zeta)]_1}$, where $\mathbb{L}$ denotes the $\mathbb{Q}$ -lattice generated by the vectors produced by evaluating a basis of $H_1(E_1, \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H_2(E_1 \times E_2, \mathbb{Q})$ on $\mathfrak{B}$. Obviously a basis for $H_1(E_1, \mathbb{Q})^{\otimes 2} \otimes H_1(E_2, \mathbb{Q})$ will suffice; taking this to be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C} = \{ & \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \beta_2, \alpha_1 \otimes \beta_1 \otimes \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \otimes \beta_1 \otimes \beta_2, \\ & \beta_1 \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2, \beta_1 \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \beta_2, \beta_1 \otimes \beta_1 \otimes \alpha_2, \beta_1 \otimes \beta_1 \otimes \beta_2 \}, \end{aligned}$$

we have the following generators for $\mathbb{L}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & (0, \Omega_{1\alpha}\Omega_{2\alpha}), (0, \Omega_{1\alpha}\Omega_{2\beta}), (0, \Omega_{1\beta}\Omega_{2\alpha}), (0, \Omega_{1\beta}\Omega_{2\beta}), \\ & (\Omega_{1\alpha}\Omega_{2\alpha}, 0), (\Omega_{1\alpha}\Omega_{2\beta}, 0), (\Omega_{1\beta}\Omega_{2\alpha}, 0), (\Omega_{1\beta}\Omega_{2\beta}, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Main argument: Assume $\overline{[AJ(\zeta)]_1} = 0$ and $AJ_{E_2}((q) - (o)) \neq 0$ (in the rational Jacobian). The second condition means that $\xi \notin \mathbb{Q}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle$. The first translates to $\vec{\nu}_{\mathcal{Z}} \in \mathbb{L}$, hence to the two equations

$$(16.1) \quad \xi = a_1\Omega_{2\alpha} + a_2\Omega_{2\beta} + a_3\tau_1\Omega_{2\alpha} + a_4\tau_1\Omega_{2\beta}$$

$$(16.2) \quad \xi = b_1\tau_1^{-1}\Omega_{2\alpha} + b_2\tau_1^{-1}\Omega_{2\beta} + b_3\Omega_{2\alpha} + b_4\Omega_{2\beta},$$

for some $a_k, b_k \in \mathbb{Q}$. We cannot have a_3 and a_4 both zero; nor can b_1 and b_2 both be zero. Without loss of generality, we may assume $b_3 = b_4 = 0$. (This is seen by adding topological 1-cycles to $\overrightarrow{o_2 \cdot q}$, which effects translations of ξ and $\vec{v}_Z$ by respective elements of $\mathbb{Q}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle$ and $\mathbb{L}$.) Setting the right-hand sides of (16.1) and (16.2) equal gives

$$(16.3) \quad \frac{b_1\Omega_{2\alpha} + b_2\Omega_{2\beta}}{\tau_1} = a_1\Omega_{2\alpha} + a_2\Omega_{2\beta} + (a_3\Omega_{2\alpha} + a_4\Omega_{2\beta})\tau_1,$$

and multiplying by $\tau_1/\Omega_{2\alpha}$ and rearranging yields

$$(16.4) \quad \tau_1^2(a_3 + a_4\tau_2) + \tau_1(a_1 + a_2\tau_2) - (b_1 + b_2\tau_2) = 0.$$

Recall that (since E_i is defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$) each τ_i is either a quadratic irrationality ($\Leftrightarrow E_i$ has CM) or transcendental.

Case 1: Assume E_1, E_2 non-isogenous non-CM (the “general” case).

Set $u_1 = \Omega_{2\alpha}$, $u_2 = \Omega_{2\beta}$, $u_3 = \frac{b_1\Omega_{2\alpha} + b_2\Omega_{2\beta}}{\tau_1} (\neq 0)$. Then $\tau_1 = \frac{b_1u_1 + b_2u_2}{u_3}$ and (16.3) says

$$u_3 = a_1u_1 + a_2u_2 + (a_3u_1 + a_4u_2) \left(\frac{b_1u_1 + b_2u_2}{u_3} \right);$$

multiplying by u_3 gives

$$u_3^2 = a_1u_1u_3 + a_2u_2u_3 + a_3b_1u_1^2 + a_4b_2u_2^2 + (a_3b_2 + a_4b_1)u_1u_2.$$

This is a nontrivial algebraic relation amongst the $\{u_i\}$ (the coefficient of u_3^2 is 1). Now assume the following, a more general version of which appears as Conjecture 4.1 in [W]:

Conjecture: Let $\wp$ denote a Weierstrass $\wp$ -function with algebraic invariants $(g_2, g_3 \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}})$. Let $u_i \in \mathbb{C}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) be such that (for each i) u_i is a pole of $\wp$ or $\wp(u_i) \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then $\{u_i\}$ algebraically dependent $\implies \{u_i\}$ linearly dependent over

$$K_\tau := \begin{cases} \mathbb{Q} & \tau \notin \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \\ \mathbb{Q}(\tau) & \tau \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \end{cases}.$$

Remark. If true, this (apparently standard) conjecture absorbs the result of Schneider quoted under the “transcendental input” heading below.

Applying this with $\wp = \wp_2$ (and $K = \mathbb{Q}$ since E_2 doesn't have CM) yields $(A, B, C \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= Au_1 + Bu_2 + Cu_3 \\ &= A\Omega_{2\alpha} + B\Omega_{2\beta} + Cb_1(\Omega_{2\alpha}/\tau_1) + Cb_2(\Omega_{2\beta}/\tau_1); \end{aligned}$$

multiplying by $\tau_1/\Omega_{2\alpha}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= A\tau_1 + B\tau_1\tau_2 + Cb_1 + Cb_2\tau_2 \\ \implies \tau_2 &= -\frac{A\tau_1 + Cb_1}{B\tau_1 + Cb_2}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter formula implies the existence of an isogeny $E_1 \simeq E_2$, contradicting our assumption.

Case 2: Assume $E_1 \simeq E_2$ non-CM.

Then for $A, B, C, D \in \mathbb{Q}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_2 &= \frac{A + B\tau_1}{C + D\tau_1} \\ \implies 0 &= A + B\tau_1 - C\tau_2 - D\tau_1\tau_2. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by $\Omega_{2\alpha}$ gives

$$(16.5) \quad 0 = A\Omega_{2\alpha} + B\tau_1\Omega_{2\alpha} - C\Omega_{2\beta} - D\tau_1\Omega_{2\beta}.$$

Case 2a: $D \neq 0$.

Multiply (16.5) by a_4/D and add to (16.1) to get

$$(16.1') \quad \xi = a'_1\Omega_{2\alpha} + a'_2\Omega_{2\beta} + a'_3\tau_1\Omega_{2\alpha}.$$

$$(16.4') \quad a'_3\tau_1^2 + (a'_1 + a'_2\tau_2)\tau_1 - (b_1 + b_2\tau_2) = 0.$$

Substituting for τ_2 and multiplying by $(C + D\tau_1)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a'_3\tau_1^2(C + D\tau_1) + \tau_1\{a'_1(C + D\tau_1) + a'_2(A + B\tau_1)\} - \{b_1(C + D\tau_1) + b_2(A + B\tau_1)\} \\ &= \tau_1^3(a'_3D) + \tau_1^2(a'_3C + a'_1D + a'_2B) + \tau_1(a'_1C + a'_2A - b_1D - b_2B) - (b_1C + b_2A). \end{aligned}$$

This polynomial in $\tau_1 \notin \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ must vanish, hence $0 = a'_3D$. But $D = 0$ contradicts the hypothesis of *Case 2a*, while $a'_3 = 0$ together with (16.1') contradicts $\xi \notin \mathbb{Q}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle$.

Case 2b: $D = 0$.

Then we rewrite $\tau_2 = A + B\tau_1$ (absorbing C). Substituting this into (16.4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \tau_1^2\{(a_3 + a_4A) + a_4B\tau_1\} + \tau_1\{(a_1 + a_2A) + a_2B\tau_1\} - \{(b_1 + b_2A) + b_2B\tau_1\} \\ &= (a_4B)\tau_1^3 + (a_3 + a_4A + a_2B)\tau_1^2 + (a_1 + a_2A - b_2B)\tau_1 - (b_1 + b_2A). \end{aligned}$$

Again the polynomial must vanish since $\tau_1 \notin \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, so in particular $b_1 = -b_2A$. By (16.2) (with $b_3 = b_4 = 0$, of course), and $\tau_1 = \frac{\tau_2 - A}{B}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \tau_1^{-1}(b_1\Omega_{2\alpha} + b_2\Omega_{2\beta}) = \left(\frac{\Omega_{2\alpha}B}{\tau_2 - A}\right)(b_1 + b_2\tau_2) \\ &= \left(\frac{\Omega_{2\alpha}B}{\tau_2 - A}\right)(-b_2A + b_2\tau_2) = \Omega_{2\alpha}Bb_2 \in \mathbb{Q}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle, \end{aligned}$$

again a contradiction.

Case 3: E_1 or E_2 has CM.

If E_2 has CM then $\tau_2 \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ and (16.4) $\implies \tau_1 \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, hence E_1 has CM. If $E_2 \simeq E_1$ then $\text{rank}(NS) = 4$ leads to a contradiction as indicated above; so $E_1 \not\simeq E_2 \implies \mathbb{Q}\langle 1, \tau_1 \rangle \neq \mathbb{Q}\langle 1, \tau_2 \rangle$.

Hence this case reduces to: E_1 of CM, $\tau_1 \notin \mathbb{Q}\langle 1, \tau_2 \rangle$. Returning to (16.1), choose $M \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ sufficiently large that $Ma_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$; and set $\lambda_0 := Ma_3\Omega_{2\alpha} + Ma_4\Omega_{2\beta} \in \mathbb{Z}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle$. Then we have $M\xi \equiv \tau_1\lambda_0$ in $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle$. Pick $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\lambda := \frac{\lambda_0}{N} \notin \mathbb{Z}\langle\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{2\beta}\rangle$. Since $E_2/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, torsion points are algebraic and $\wp_2(\lambda) \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.

The transcendental input: It is common knowledge that the periods $\Omega_\alpha, \Omega_\beta$ of an elliptic curve defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ are transcendental. (For this and the result that follows, it is essential that $g_2, g_3 \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\omega[=dz]$ be defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ [e.g., dx/y] — rescaling is not allowed.)

Less well-known (but quite useful) is a result of T. Schneider [Sc, Satz 16 (p. 61)] which can be read as follows for $E/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ with associated Weierstrass $\wp(z)$, writing $K_\tau = \mathbb{Q}(\tau)$ if E has CM and $K_\tau = \mathbb{Q}$ otherwise:

If $u \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}\langle\Omega_\alpha, \Omega_\beta\rangle$ is such that $\wp(u) \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus K_\tau$ is such that $\mathbf{b} \cdot u \notin \mathbb{Z}\langle\Omega_\alpha, \Omega_\beta\rangle$, then $\wp(\mathbf{b} \cdot u)$ is transcendental.

We apply this to $\wp = \wp_2$ with $u = \lambda$ and $\mathbf{b} = N\tau_1$; note that since $K_{\tau_2} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}\langle 1, \tau_2 \rangle$ (whether or not E_2 has CM) and $\tau_1 \notin \mathbb{Q}\langle 1, \tau_2 \rangle$, $N\tau_1 \notin K_{\tau_2}$. Moreover, since E_1 has CM, $N\tau_1 \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. So the requirements are met and $\wp_2(N\tau_1 \cdot \lambda) = \wp_2(M\xi) \notin \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$; since the group law is algebraic $\wp_2(\xi) \notin \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. But this is the x -coordinate of q , contradicting $q \in E_2(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$. So the proof is finished.

Remark 16.2. We emphasize that the obstruction to the existence of a cycle (of the above form) in $\ker(\chi_2)$ but not $\ker(\Psi_2)$, is not Hodge-theoretic in nature. One can repeat all the constructions of this paper (except the expected injectivity of Ψ and its consequences) with the spread field $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ replaced by some $\bar{L}(\supseteq \bar{\mathbb{Q}})$. This yields (weaker) analogues of χ_2 and Ψ_2 which are defined on $\ker(\text{Alb})$. If we take $\mathcal{Z} = ((p) - (o)) \times ((q) - (o))$ with $q \in E_2(\bar{L})$ and p not

defined $/\bar{L}$, the computations proceed as above, with the same Hodge-theoretic target spaces. Moreover, in this case there is no contradiction at the end of the above proof.

For example, take $E_1, E_2/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\tau_1 = \sqrt{-1}$ (so E_1 has CM) and pick $q = (\wp_2(\sqrt{-1}\Omega_{2\alpha}), \wp'_2(\sqrt{-1}\Omega_{2\alpha})) \in E_2(\mathbb{C})$ so that $AJ_{E_2}((q) - (o)) \equiv \sqrt{-1}\Omega_{2\alpha}$. This q is actually defined over some L with $\text{trdeg}(L/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = 1$, and we can tensor E_1 and E_2 up to $\bar{L}$. Then we take $p \in E_1(\mathbb{C})$ very general and not defined $/\bar{L}$, and spread $\mathcal{Z}$ (defined as above) out over $\bar{L}$. Essentially by §15 $\Psi_2^{\bar{L}}(\mathcal{Z}) \neq 0$, while $\chi_2^{\bar{L}}(\mathcal{Z})$ identifies with $\vec{v}_{\mathcal{Z}} = (\Omega_{1\alpha} \cdot \sqrt{-1}\Omega_{2\alpha}, \Omega_{1\beta} \cdot \sqrt{-1}\Omega_{2\alpha}) = (\tau_1\Omega_{1\alpha} \cdot \Omega_{2\alpha}, -\frac{1}{\tau_1}\Omega_{1\beta} \cdot \Omega_{2\alpha}) = (\Omega_{1\beta}\Omega_{2\alpha}, -\Omega_{1\alpha}\Omega_{2\alpha}) \in \mathbb{L}$ and hence is 0 in $\mathbb{C}^2/\mathbb{L}$.

17. 0-CYCLES ON SPECIAL KUMMER SURFACES

Let $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{P}^1$ be an elliptic fibration (defined $/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$) where $\mathcal{E}$ is an exceptional $K3$ surface (i.e. $\text{rank}(\text{Pic}(\mathcal{E})) = 20$); the Fermat quartic is the example we have in mind. The following questions arise, if we take a smooth “algebraic” fiber $E_q = \pi^{-1}(q)$ ($q \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$), with general point p and algebraic base point $o/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Since $H^0(\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}^1) = 0$,

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{E}} := (p) - (o) \in \ker(\text{Alb}).$$

Is $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{E}})$ nontrivial? Is $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{E}} \stackrel{\text{rat}}{\neq} 0$?

One approach to the first question is to try and compute it by the differential character approach, i.e. the membrane integrals (11.1). Since $\text{trdeg}(\mathcal{Z}/\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) = 1$, $[\zeta]_2 = 0$ and so $\Psi_2(\mathcal{Z}) = [AJ\zeta]_1$; moreover since $H_{tr}^{1,1}(\mathcal{E}) = 0$, $\chi_2(\mathcal{Z}) = [AJ(\zeta)]_1^{tr}$. So this is a rare instance (like the self-product of a CM elliptic curve in §14) where the membrane integrals derived from loops on $S [= E_q \text{ here}]$ compute (essentially) the entire invariant.

Let’s be concrete about these: spreading $\{p\}$ merely gives the image of Δ_{E_q} under $E_q \times E_q \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times \iota_q} E_q \times \mathcal{E}$. Take cycles $\alpha, \beta \in H_1(E_q)$ and let $\mu_{\alpha}, \mu_{\beta}$ be bounding membranes $\in C_2(\mathcal{E})$ (possible since $H_1(\mathcal{E}) = 0$). One merely has to show that $\int_{\mu_{\alpha}}$ and $\int_{\mu_{\beta}}$ do not both give torsion classes in $\{H^{2,0}(\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{C})\}^{\vee}/\text{im}\{H_2(\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{Z})\}$. Moreover $H^{2,0}(\mathcal{E})$ is generated by some Ω which has only 2 nontrivial periods. Now for instance the Fermat quartic has “CM” (in this case, an order-4 automorphism) and it follows that the period ratio is $1 : i$. So we merely have to show that **no integral multiple of $\int_{\mu_{\alpha}} \Omega / \int_{\mu_{\beta}} \Omega$ is a Gaussian integer**. (At least this would be *sufficient*.)

We venture a guess that it is transcendental, but pursue an alternate route (and answer only the second question above). Consider the fact that the Fermat quartic is a *special Kummer surface* ([PS], [PL]). That is, it may be constructed

as a blow-up of a quotient of a product of elliptic curves. Namely, if $E_1(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}\langle 1, \frac{i}{2} \rangle$ and $E_2(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}/\mathbb{Z}\langle 1, i \rangle$ then the action of $(-id_1, -id_2) : E_1 \times E_2 \rightarrow E_1 \times E_2$ induces a quotient morphism $\theta : E_1 \times E_2 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{E}}$. Products of 2-torsion points give rise to 16 singular points; blowing these up yields $b : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{E}}$, with $\mathcal{E}$ a K3 surface fibered over $E_2/\langle -id_2, id_2 \rangle \cong \mathbb{P}^1$.

For example, if $E_2 = \overline{\{y^2 = x^3 - 5x\}}$ then $\{x, y\} \mapsto \{x\} \in \mathbb{P}^1$ gives the map $E_2 \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathbb{P}^1$. The singular fibers of $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{P}^1$ lie over the ρ -images of the 2-torsion points, namely $\{\pm\sqrt{5}, 0, \infty\}$. They consist of (connected) configurations of rational curves. So any two points on a singular fiber are rationally equivalent. On the other hand, the restriction of θ to $E_1 \times (E_2 \setminus \{2\text{-torsion}\})$ gives an étale double cover of the smooth fibers $\pi^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{\pm\sqrt{5}, 0, \infty\})$.

Now take points $o = \rho^{-1}(\infty)$ and $\xi \in E_2(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ such that the class $(\xi) - (o)$ is nontorsion, and write $q := \rho(\xi) \in \mathbb{P}^1(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}) \setminus \{\pm\sqrt{5}, 0, \infty\}$. Also write $o \in E_1(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$ for a base point and $p \in E_1(\mathbb{C})$ for a very general point. As above, we denote the push-forward of $(p) - (o)$ under the composition $E_1 = E_1 \times \{\xi\} \xrightarrow[b^{-1} \circ \theta]{\cong} \pi^{-1}(q) =: E_q \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ by $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{E}}$. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be another 0-cycle on $\mathcal{E}$, consisting of a difference of two points in $\pi^{-1}(\infty)$ such that $b_*(\mathcal{W}) = \theta_*((o, o) - (p, o))$. Finally, define $\mathcal{Z} := (p, \xi) - (o, \xi) - (p, o) + (o, o) \in Z_0(E_1 \times E_2/\mathbb{C})$.

From Proposition 15.1, we know $\mathcal{Z} \not\equiv^{\text{rat}} 0$; while $\mathcal{W} \equiv^{\text{rat}} 0$ is obvious. Moreover, $\mathcal{Z}$ is the 2-box $B(p, \xi)$ with $\theta^*\theta_*\mathcal{Z} = B(p, \xi) + B(-p, -\xi)$; explicit rational equivalences show $B(p, \xi) \equiv^{\text{rat}} B(-p, -\xi)$, and so $\theta^*\theta_*\mathcal{Z} \equiv^{\text{rat}} 2\mathcal{Z} \not\equiv^{\text{rat}} 0$. It follows that $0 \not\equiv^{\text{rat}} \theta_*\mathcal{Z} = b_*(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{E}} + \mathcal{W})$, so that $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{E}} + \mathcal{W} \not\equiv^{\text{rat}} 0$; hence $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{E}} \not\equiv^{\text{rat}} 0$, as we wanted to show.

Of course, this is not surprising in light of the isomorphism between the Albanese kernels of an abelian variety and its associated Kummer surface, proved by Bloch in [BKL, appendix].

REFERENCES

- [B1] S. Bloch, “Lectures on algebraic cycles”, Duke Math Series IV, 1980.
- [B2] —, *Some elementary theorems about algebraic cycles on Abelian varieties*, Invent. Math. 37 (1976), no. 3, pp. 215-228.
- [BKL] S. Bloch, A. Kas and D. Lieberman, *Zero cycles on surfaces with $p_g = 0$* , Compositio Math. 33 (1976), no.2, 135-145.
- [Ca] J. Carlson, *Extensions of mixed Hodge structures*, Journées de Géométrie Algébrique d’Angers 1979, Sijthof and Nordhof (1980), pp. 107-127.
- [De1] P. Deligne, *Theorie de Hodge II*, Publ. Math. IHES 40 (1971), pp. 5-58.
- [De2] —, *Theorie de Hodge III*, Publ. Math. IHES 44 (1974), pp. 5-77.

- [EP] H. Esnault and K. Paranjape, *Remarks on absolute de Rham and absolute Hodge cycles*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math 319 (1994), no. 1, pp. 67-72.
- [EV] H. Esnault and E. Viehweg, *Deligne-Beilinson cohomology*, Beilinson's Conjectures on Special Values of L -functions, Academic Press, Boston, 1988, pp. 43-92.
- [Gr1] M. Green, *Higher Abel-Jacobi maps*, Proceedings of the ICM (Berlin, 1998), Doc. Math. 1998, Extra Vol. II, pp. 267-276.
- [Gr2] —, *Infinitesimal methods in Hodge theory*, Algebraic cycles and Hodge theory (Torino, 1993), Lecture Notes in math. 159, Springer, 1994, pp. 1-92.
- [Gr3] —, Notes from the Banff conference, June 1998.
- [GG1] M. Green and P. Griffiths, *On the tangent space to the space of algebraic cycles on a smooth projective variety*, preprint, 2001.
- [GG2] —, *An interesting 0-cycle*, Duke Math. J. 119 (2003), no. 2, 261-313.
- [GG3] —, *Hodge-theoretic invariants for algebraic cycles*, Intl. Math. Res. Not. 2003, no. 9, pp. 477-510.
- [G] P. Griffiths, "Introduction to algebraic curves", American Math. Society, Providence, 1989.
- [GH] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, "Principles of Algebraic Geometry", John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1978.
- [GS] P. Griffiths and W. Schmid, *Recent developments in Hodge theory: a discussion of techniques and results*, Discrete subgroups of Lie groups and applications to moduli (Bombay 1973), Oxford Univ. Press, 1975, pp. 31-127.
- [H] H. Hironaka, *Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero*, Ann. Math. 79 (1964), pp. 109-326.
- [Ja1] U. Jannsen, *Deligne homology, Hodge D -conjecture, and motives*, Beilinson's conjectures on special values of L -functions, Academic Press, Boston, 1988, pp. 305-372.
- [Ja2] —, "Mixed motives and algebraic K -theory", Lecture Notes in Math. 1400, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.
- [Ke1] M. Kerr, *A regulator formula for Milnor K -groups*, K -Theory 29 (2003), pp. 175-210.
- [Ke2] —, *An elementary proof of Suslin reciprocity*, to appear in Can. Math. Bull.
- [Ke3] —, *Geometric construction of regulator currents with applications to algebraic cycles*, Princeton thesis, 2003.
- [Ke4] —, *A survey of transcendental methods in the study of Chow groups of zero-cycles*, to appear in proceedings of Banff conference (Dec. 2003) on CY varieties.
- [Ke5] —, *Exterior products of zero-cycles*, to appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.
- [KL] M. Kerr and J. Lewis, *Higher normal functions*, to appear.
- [KLM] M. Kerr, J. Lewis and S. Muller-Stach, *The Abel-Jacobi map for higher Chow groups*, to appear in Compositio Math., 2006.
- [Kl] S. Kleiman, *Algebraic cycles and the Weil conjectures*, in "Dix exposés sur la cohomologie des schémas", North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968, pp. 359-386.
- [L1] J. Lewis, "A survey of the Hodge conjecture," (2nd edition), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1999.
- [L2] —, *A filtration on the Chow groups of a complex projective variety*, Compositio Math. 128 (2001), no. 3, pp. 299-322.
- [Mu] D. Mumford, *Rational equivalence of 0-cycles on surfaces*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 9 (1968), pp. 195-204.

- [M] J. Murre, *On the motive of an algebraic surface*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 409 (1990), pp. 190-204.
- [PS] I. Piatetski-Shapiro and I. Shafarevich, *A Torelli theorem for algebraic surfaces of type K3*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vol. 5 (1971), No. 3, pp. 547-588.
- [PL] C. Peters and E. Looijenga, *Torelli theorems for Kahler K3 surfaces*, Compositio Math. 42 (1980/81), no. 2, pp. 145-186.
- [Ro] A. Roitman, *Rational equivalence of zero-dimensional cycles* (Russian), Mat. Zametki 28(1), (1980), pp. 85-90, 169.
- [R] J. Rosenberg, "Algebraic K -theory and its applications," Graduate Texts in Math. 147, Springer, 1994.
- [RS] A. Rosenschon and M. Saito, *Cycle map for strictly decomposable cycles*, preprint, 2001.
- [mS] M. Saito, *Filtrations on Chow groups and transcendence degree*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 40 (2004), no. 3, pp. 933-948.
- [sS] S. Saito, *Hodge-theoretic approach to generalization of Abel's theorem*, notes from Morelia conference on algebraic cycles.
- [Sc] T. Schneider, "Einführung in die transzendenten Zahlen" (German), Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, 1957.
- [T] B. Totaro, *Milnor K -theory is the simplest part of algebraic K -theory*, K -theory 6 (1992), pp. 177-189.
- [W] M. Waldschmidt, *Variations on the six exponentials theorem*, Algebra and Number Theory: Proceedings of the Silver Jubilee Conference (Hyderabad, 2003), Hindustan Book Agency, 2005.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, IL 60637
USA

matkerr@math.uchicago.edu